THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, B.D., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XIII SEPTEMBER, 1926 No. 75

EDITORIAL

ST. FRANCIS AND HIS MESSAGE

The articles in this number are devoted to the commemoration of two great figures of the Catholic Church, whose centenaries will be celebrated within the next few weeks—St. Francis of Assisi, who died on October 3, 1226, at the age of forty-five, and Lancelot Andrewes, who died on September 26, 1626. The variety of ways in which honour is being paid to St. Francis, in places so distant and so different as London and Australia, as Assisi and Newcastle-on-Tyne, is the surest proof of the undying magnetism of a life which was completely set upon the imitation of the Master; as it is also a reassuring sign that the much-bruited materialism of our age has not irremediably blunted our perception of beauty of character, when we see it. We are fortunate in having secured the help of a group of writers for this issue who well represent the many-sided interests to which St. Francis makes appeal. We had hoped also to include an article on St. Francis's influence upon art from the accomplished pen of Mr. Berenson, but this has not been possible. The omission will, however, be remedied in November, when we intend to publish the lecture on this subject which Professor O'Rourke Dickey, Professor of Fine Art at Armstrong College, will deliver at Newcastle in Octo ber.

What if St. Francis were to come among us to-day? Not long ago the Prime Minister expressed the belief that nothing could do more to restore the spirit of England than an order of Preaching Friars. The saying probably came home to many of us as something of a challenge. How would that fit in with the domesticity which is one of the prevailing marks of the English Church? No doubt it is less obvious and less undiluted than it was: the continued growth of the Religious Orders has seen to that. But it is still a big factor to be reckoned with. The marriage of clergy has something to do

with it, but by no means all: circumstances alone give to many a parsonage a smack of Franciscan poverty, pain, and joy. It is deeper than that, and has to do with that ingrained love of comfort which seems part and parcel of English character. If we have an idol in this country, it is comfort—the comfort of soul, which is summed up in the word Home, and the comfort of body, well furnished with fireside and arm-chair. The danger of this love of comfort is that it tends to dull our spiritual sympathy and imagination: at its worst, it degenerates into luxury.

An order of Preaching Friars presupposes a Francis; and perhaps the first thing we should notice about him would be his contempt of comfort. But it would not be the Cynic's contempt—not contempt for its own sake; and we should go on at once to see that the asceticism was subordinate to a passionate and absorbing purpose of love to God and man. Dorcas Easton in *Shepherd Easton's Daughter* gives us perhaps a kind of image of it, with her combination of the mystical and the practical—the love of God always embodying itself in the arduous adventure of kindness. And inevitably such a life is artistic. It is not merely that it gives the chronicler—or his modern counterpart, the journalist—something to write about, and the painter something to paint. When it is on St. Francis's scale, and has also behind it the whole weight of the Church's authority, then it gives every man something to copy. It offers to society, in short, a new *standard of living*—not in that hackneyed sense which is the stock-in-trade of industrial disputants, but in its true and large sense of something which is an example for men to live by.

And it was surely thus that St. Francis was the greatest social reformer of his day. He set before men the one standard of living which it is the work of the Church to provide—the standard, the force, of personal example. St. Francis is representative of one of the most striking contrasts between mediæval days and our own. It concerns the type of reaction which the Church made to social disorder and distress. The notion that Europe was politically and economically better ordered in the Middle Ages than it is to-day is one which probably no genuine historian would now maintain. On the contrary, it was impoverished by continual wars and civil strife, swept by devastating pestilences, beset by the sense of insecurity of which the expectation of the speedy end of the world was a recurrent symptom. In all this the life of most people then was subject to all the

social ills which we reckon ourselves to be suffering from to-day. Yet the Church's reaction to this state of affairs was markedly different. Perhaps we can best sum it up when we say that they knew and used—and we do not—the power of art as a remedy. Take any one Italian city—Florence or Venice or Siena—and study its churches and galleries on the background of its contemporary history: what a lesson it conveys! There is Siena, for instance, with its several pictures of the Massacre of the Innocents, including one of Sodoma's masterpieces. Like the Nativity, the Crucifixion, the Deposition from the Cross, the subject belongs to the main line of the story of Christ. But one cannot suppose that the artist was blind to all its terrible realism: the incident itself is irredeemably unbeautiful. Yet it is a great subject, in that it challenges the mind to face the choice between two alternative interpretations of life. Either he will say: "How can I believe in a religion which reckons the deliverance of one Child as worth the slaughter of so many others? If God could only save the world at the price of such indiscriminate suffering of innocent people, infants and their mothers and fathers, then that is not the salvation I want nor the God whom I can worship." Or he will say: "That cruel suffering of the innocent is the kind of thing which happens in all uncivilized peoples: it happened a few years since in Asia Minor: it is happening to-day in China; nay, it is happening in England, though in less graphic form, in thousands of families where the bread-winner is thrown out of work because there is no coal. Yet there is one redeeming feature, one saving clause: out of the awful carnage there is saved one Baby—and that Baby is to change the face of the world." And the second of these contains the kernel of Christian philosophy.

But the artist went on to develop his theme. He looked on the saints as those who had translated this creed into terms of life, and made it real by pre-eminent example. In that very fact they had become artistic subjects, causing to stand out on the canvas of history the Manhood of the Master. But more than that: they have made their adversaries artistic too, by showing them to be not so much their adversaries as God's; for the character of an adversary of God must have in it some vein of uncommon strength. And the result is that those artists wrote the history of their time in its true native language —the language of personal character and motive, with the grammar of faith in the background. And that is a language men can understand. It brings home to the public mind the universal element in all particular distresses and disputes, and

so turns it away from the iron laws of economics and the insoluble problems of life's injustices to those ultimate inequalities in men and that ultimate justice of God with which the Gospel of redemption is concerned.

Yet, at the same time, this is not a philosophy of escape. The artist faces the facts; but, true to his craft, he chooses those that matter most—the spiritual facts rather than the economic; and by dint of forcing society to attend to these, he creates the atmosphere in which social reformation becomes practicable. It is an atmosphere dominated by the two figures of the saint and the artist—the saint embodying the spiritual facts, the artist interpreting them to the world; and the result is a propaganda for social righteousness, all the more powerful because it is indirect, non-political, and unconscious. If this is so, moreover, the charge so often brought against Catholicism, that it fails to mould society because all its energies are concentrated on making individual saints, is seen to rest on a fallacy. There is no greater work the Church can do towards redressing social wrongs than the making of sanctity, provided it is the genuine sanctity of a Francis or an Andrewes. For this means that the Church is sprinkling society with lives of such outstanding pattern that they catch the imagination of the artists, and are by them reflected back upon the hearts and consciences of the mass of men. And it is there—in the heart and the conscience—that Christ's redeeming and reforming work is done.

We have left ourselves little space in which to speak of Andrewes, a man so different from St. Francis alike in character and in the circumstances of his life. And yet Andrewes, too, stands for a great thing. His crabbed theology may be scarcely read to-day, and the controversial issues which he handled are being approached now from a different angle. But the *Preces Privatæ* are still a joy and inspiration to thousands, and will be so long as Englishmen pray. For they represent with peculiar vividness the balanced synthesis, the clear proportion of tradition, reason, and experience, and the gentle yet sparkling spirit of devotion which are the Church of England's great and permanent contribution to the manifold life of the City of God.

ST. FRANCIS THE MAN

SEVEN hundred years is a good test of a man, whether he belongs to the living or the dead. And if his septuacentenary stirs world-wide interest, and gives pleasure to a great number of quite ordinary people, there is something in that life very vital, waiting to be explained; or rather, not waiting to be explained at all, in the broad sense, but explaining itself by that very fact.

I cannot think of any man in history whose memory could evoke a livelier septuacentenary than that of St. Francis of Assisi which this year is celebrating.

Why is Francis of Assisi so much alive—as a personality one of the most alive people the world has ever produced? You may name men—even among his own contemporaries—of far greater intellectual power. Innocent III. was one of the greatest of the Popes; he represented Christ for the Church at a most difficult and critical turning-point of her advance to power. Frederic, 'the World's Wonder'—an opponent of that advance, and a defeated opponent—was certainly one of the most remarkable men in history whose record stands for failure; and there are probably many to-day who think that his failure to make good against the temporal encroachments of the Papacy was one of the greatest tragedies and setbacks to humanistic culture of the Middle Ages. But even those who are temperamentally drawn to admire proud success or fine failure—and there are many enough of both minds to provide the numbers—even those so minded could not hope to see a celebration of the septuacentenary of these two great protagonists of opposing causes—as spontaneously felt or as widely recognized as the septuacentenary of St. Francis. Why is it?

I am going to suggest the reason by comparison with a tercentenary celebration of fairly recent date which had about it a similar liveliness—the tercentenary of Shakespeare. Though of Shakespeare's life we know hardly anything, while of the life of St. Francis we know a great deal, the tercentenary of Shakespeare was not merely a ceremonial function, it was a living memorial: the man himself came through; and that is really the test of all centenaries—whether they are living or dead. Shakespeare came through because, though we know nothing of his life, in his plays he is still magnificently alive. He was a maker of many plays, and we have them all; St. Francis was the maker of one play only, a play that lasted twenty years. He lived playing it; and his play, presented

with all the temperament of an artist, was the pattern and example of Christ.

It is not usual to consider St. Francis as a great artist, but the peculiar quality of his life, the way he lived it, and the extraordinary liveliness of his personality belong to the domain of art; and I am not at all sure that the secret of the fascination St. Francis has for the world does not lie in the fact that he was the artist turned saint, and that he was so beautiful to the eyes of his contemporaries, and remains so still, simply because he carried his artistry into holy life.

The artist turned saint is rare, and the reason is fairly obvious. The artist is sensuous, and has a right to be sensuous, with a good conscience. He fulfils himself, expresses his personality as it was born to be expressed, by the creation of beautiful things. The *modus operandi* of the saints—of those of the Middle Ages, at any rate—has been to put beautiful things behind them, and to avoid all sensuous indulgence; a course, therefore, to which the artist by nature would be the last to turn. Fra Angelico struck a happy harmony, but though saintly in the direction of his art, he was rather the recorder than the doer; and in the fortunate circumstance that the Church absorbed and gave fulfilment to his powers as a painter he found his vocation. His patron was there ready and waiting for him; entering a life of religion he entered his profession, with the way made broad before him.

For St. Francis the case was very different. The form of his art was not a form for which the Church at that time could find ready employment. Nothing is more evident, in the event of his conversion, than the obvious difficulty he had in fitting his sense of a religious vocation to the institutional Christianity of his day. This way and that he casts desperately for a solution; the formalism of the Church repels him; where he looks for a door he finds barriers, and driven by the imperious need for self-expression—more strong in the artist than in others—he has to discover his own formula, to do an absolutely original thing, outside the direction of Mother Church, before he can find the matrix into which his life is to pour itself and find fulfilment.

Had he been by nature a painter or a poet, St. Francis might have joined the immortals on a lower scale than that which he attained, and might, from a worldly point of view, have lived a more contented life, expressing his sense of beauty —the beauty of holiness—in a more attainable form of art than that which he made so strangely his own. But though we hear, on one or two occasions, that he drew, and that, when he took up a craft in the early days of the Brotherhood, he

chose wood-carving, we have no reason for thinking that he did these things specially well; his "Canticle of the Sun" is spiritually beautiful and expressive, but it is not great art. The artistry of Francis lay in another direction—he was the instinctive dramatist, the play-actor, and with this gift went another, an extraordinary power of imaginative sympathy, which made him a wonderful reader and manipulator of human nature. That is the sort of artist he was, that was his equipment; and when conversion fell upon him, or when—to put it in other words—quite literally, he fell in love with Love, then the dramatist and the sympathetic reader of human nature was driven to find a form for his art that should immediately and without circumlocution express the central idea that had hold of him. That central idea was Love, which, to his spiritual understanding, had been pre-eminently expressed in two great events of the world's history—the Creation and the Incarnation. Francis set himself to express the idea of the Creation and the idea of the Incarnation in terms of beauty, and, being a dramatist, the method he chose was the representative method, not self-consciously, but instinctively. Thenceforth his life became charged with two patterns, whose imprint lay upon all his actions and words—the pattern of God's mind in the work of Creation, and the pattern of God's mind in the work of the Incarnation and Redemption. Of these, in deep humility, forever protesting his unworthiness, he made his own life and teaching the image. In the simplest parable of words—"Brother Sun," "Sister Moon," "Brother Fire," "Sister Water"—he set before men's minds the essential unity in the divine purpose of all created things, and in the most compelling parable of the acts of his daily life he set forth, as faithfully, as literally, and as beautifully as he knew how, the life and character of Christ.

It was an amazing experiment of individualism *versus* institutionalism, and the opposition was an unconscious one; Francis was an artist, not a theologian; problems of dogma did not trouble him; to the one or two which presented themselves in the course of his ministry he gave a beautiful humanist solution which happened also to be orthodox, and passed on his way, independent, unembarrassed, submissive to the ruling of Mother Church, but curiously at large in the glorious liberty of an evangelism based on a few of the simplest sayings of Christ to His disciples, to which the disciples had themselves given the same practical interpretation as Francis himself. Thus, without disputation, without involving himself in theological arguments for which he had no mind, Francis presented the world with a human view of Christ which to

many must have come with almost the force of a new gospel. Some, looking back to that day, a day of dangerous divisions and heresies—hold that the Pope's dream of him was really true, and that his revivifying influence, bringing back into the Church something which it had lost of the life and mind of Christ, saved it from falling into those further and greater schisms which were threatening it. When Francis knelt and for the love of God kissed the hand of the ill-living priest, whose effective administration of the sacraments the Cathari denied, he presented the spectators with something more moving than argument; when he answered the pious conundrum of a disputatious Dominican, suspicious of his large charity toward sinners: How was a man to fulfil the Scriptural injunction of rebuking the wicked without ceasing?—when Francis answered: "By living the life of the gospel," his sheer spiritual commonsense, illumined, as always, by love, and by his faith in the prevailing power of that gospel which he preached—put theology back into its proper place, for that time at any rate.

In his doing and saying of these things there was a gracious ease of mind independent of intellectual power. They came naturally from him; they came because of his transparent simplicity and sincerity; they came by an art which had turned to holiness as the most beautiful and attractive thing that the human mind could know. It was quite a new idea—it still is with some people: so new that they have not got to it—that goodness, when well presented, is to human nature more naturally attractive than evil.

Because he was an artist in human nature, and a lover of human nature, St. Francis had faith in human nature. It is a faith which the world—unable to present goodness so attractively as St. Francis did—still lacks. Were we all artists like him, our duty towards our neighbour would become a game. He played it so beautifully that the memory of how he played it is still with us—a possession for the meek upon earth. "Joculatores Domini" (The Lord's Players) was the name which Francis and his Brotherhood were known by at the beginning of their ministry. They played the Lord's game, and never wished for a better.

LAURENCE HOUSMAN.

ST. FRANCIS THE MYSTIC

WHEN, as is recorded in the *Fioretti*,* Brother Bernard of Quintavalle permitted himself an act of holy espionage on St. Francis at prayer, he heard him say all night long nothing but the words "My God, my God." And in this he heard the prayer of the true Mystic. St. Francis of Assisi has appealed to a more varied selection of mankind than any other saint save the King of Saints, our Lord Himself, and, perhaps, His Blessed Mother, Mary. And this is so because of the variety of his talents, the many-sidedness of his character; in other words, because of the share of Universality he had succeeded, by stupendous efforts, in absorbing into and realizing in himself. Accordingly, just as there are those who miss the main point of our Lord's life by regarding Him as merely a social reformer, a moral teacher, an ecstatic dreamer, and so on according as He fits into their favourite theories, so it is the case with St. Francis. To some he is pre-eminently a great reformer, to others the prince of ascetics, while a third class is attracted by the nervous directness and force of his deeds and his writings, or by the charm of his chivalry and never-failing courtesy. Just as Christ was all that his various admirers have said of Him, yet to the Christian infinitely more, so His humble follower and lovingly slavish imitator St. Francis is all this and yet infinitely more. To have failed to see in him first and foremost and above all things the Lover of God, is to have failed to see him at all in any true light. Mr. Chesterton† has —as is usual with him—gone to the very heart of things when he says: "As St. Francis did not love humanity, but men, so he did not love Christianity, but Christ. Say, if you think so, that he was a lunatic loving an imaginary person; but it is an imaginary person, not an imaginary idea. And for the modern reader the clue to the asceticism and all the rest can best be found in the stories of lovers when they seemed to be rather like lunatics. Tell it as the tale of one of the Troubadours and the wild things he would do for his lady, and the whole of the modern puzzle [of the problem of St. Francis] disappears. In such a romance there would be no contradiction between the poet gathering flowers in the sun and enduring a freezing vigil in the snow, between his praising all earthly and bodily beauty and then refusing to eat, between his showing pathetically a hunger for a happy life and a thirst for

* English translation, *The Little Flowers of St. Francis of Assisi*, by T. W. Arnold, p. 4.

† *St. Francis of Assisi*, pp. 14, 15.

a heroic death. All these riddles could easily be resolved in the simplicity of any noble love: only this was so noble that nine men out of ten have hardly ever heard of it."

Such a love is the love of the Mystic, and it is the main essential characteristic of Mysticism. To the Mystic God is literally "all in all." He is *the* Lover, not merely *a* lover, of God. Thus the late Father Louismet, whose works, though rather unbalanced and prone to exaggeration, have done so much to make "the wayfaring men, though fools," understand something of the mystical life, declares: "Divine contemplation . . . requires two persons, the loving God and the loving soul; it is interchange between them of marks of mutual affection."* And Father Doyle,† the Jesuit zealot for God who died only the other day, defines contemplation—*i.e.*, the prayer of the Mystic—as "the uplifting of the soul to God by a simple intuition full of affection."

Thomas of Celano,‡ the biographer of St. Francis, has left it on record that "his chiefest study was to be free from all the things that are in the world, lest the serenity of his mind might even for a moment be troubled by the taint of any dust. He made himself insensible to the din of all outward things and, gathering up with all his might from every side the outward senses, and keeping the natural impulses in check, occupied himself with God alone. . . . Accordingly he often used to choose out solitary places in order that he might therein wholly direct his mind to God; but yet, when he saw the time was favourable, he was not slothful in attending to business and in applying himself gladly to the salvation of his neighbours. For his safest haven was prayer; not prayer for one moment, not vacant or presumptuous prayer, but long continued, full of devotion, calm, and humble; if he began late he scarce ended with morning. Walking, sitting, eating, and drinking, he was intent on prayer."

St. Teresa of Spain, whose writings on Mysticism are a classic and an indispensable aid to the understanding of so difficult a subject, founded a number of convents and yet attained to the loftiest heights of mystical prayer. Father Doyle, whom we have already quoted, was a well-beloved chaplain in the late war, never neglecting for a moment his duties, but always, in the midst of his activities, with the thought of God in his mind. So St. Francis might work zealously for his Order, for the poor, for the sick, for the reformation of morals, for the Universal Brotherhood, not only

* *Divine Contemplation for All*, p. 2.
† See *A Manual of Mystical Theology*, Devine, ch. iii., p. 29.
‡ *Lives of St. Francis*, i., 71.

of man, but of the whole creation, precisely because he lived always in closest contact with the Creator of all. He cared for the poor and the outcast because God cared for them; he loved the sparrows and the lilies of the field because God loved them, and because his love for God had taught him to love and care for them. The Mystic is no mere visionary: he displays, as he only can display, something of the ceaseless activity of God. But he differs from the mere philanthropist or the mere reformer in that he cares for man because God cares for him, and he seeks to make things better because God so seeks. The thought of God comes always first, and he approaches Creation through the Creator, not the Creator through Creation.

And St. Francis's notable asceticism, his passion for My Lady Poverty, and so on, both arose from the same source, his love of God. There are those, like some of the Hindu Mystics, who make asceticism an end in itself, for the sake of the power it undoubtedly brings in its train. To the Christian Mystic asceticism is a means and not an end. It is necessary to the Via Purgativa, which is the initial stage of the Mystic Way. And the root idea of it is the removal of all that separates from God and from the realization of His place in Creation. One of the root principles of Mysticism is self-annihilation. By "the self" here the Mystic means the lower self, that part of the soul which, by its desires and aims, makes for a conflict between the human will and the Divine Will. "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven" is his prayer, and, in order that that prayer may be realized, he must be "crucified to the world, and the world to him," in St. Paul's arresting phrase. So St. Francis's vivid spirit seized on a devotion to Poverty as the way of freedom. Poverty of goods freed him from dependence on creatures, poverty of mind from dependence on the mere intellect, and prepared the soul for the reception of the Divine message. The modern world, with its organized charity and its fondness for regimentation, will not, perhaps, find much sympathy for St. Francis's definite organization of begging. But to St. Francis begging was an important principle. Like his Master before him, he gave his all for God's world, and thus he held he had the right to claim at least maintenance from it out of God's store. And, even more important to his mind, begging was a means of detachment; it did violence to feelings of shame, and freed the spirit in the interests of humility. And, as with Poverty, the same help for detachment was to be obtained from the two other elements of the Religious Rule, Obedience and Chastity. From Obedience came detachment from one's own will, from Chastity detachment from the carnal desires of the body. If in these later days we have come to a

fuller appreciation of the body as at least a potential friend and ally, and find difficulty in accepting St. Francis's description of it as "Brother Ass," yet it will not do to forget that in his age the body typified the lower self, and so was to be warred upon in the interest of the truer and higher self. And, with all our greater knowledge, we do not always attain the simple and striking results which the older asceticism attained. In this, perhaps, Father Doyle, who lived out in himself the ruder Franciscan tradition, has something to teach us.

The Mystic, living for God only, and striving to banish from his soul all lower desires, seeks to reproduce in himself the simplicity and directness of God. To a world immersed in its own complicated diversity, he must often appear an exaggeration. His directness of speech and of method is always startling, and not infrequently even shocking. Thus the Cross was "an offence" to the Law-soaked Jew; and to not a few callow Christians some of our Lord's own actions, such as the violent Cleansing of the Temple, and of His words, such as the equally violent Cursing of the Barren Fig-tree, have proved really shocking. The stark simplicity of St. Francis has proved equally shocking, as when he stripped himself naked before the astounded Bishop of Assisi in order to signalize, in a way that admitted of no mistake, his complete independence of his father Pietro Bernadone. Henceforth he would have no father but God. And such exuberance was not confined to acts of protest like this one: it ran all through his life, and exhibited itself most strikingly in the exuberance of his joy, that most excellent fruit of the Spirit which is not always, as it should be, associated with religion. Yet to the Mystic joy is natural: it is a projection into ordinary life of the unspeakable joy he has experienced in his direct contact with God. It is characteristic of the Mystic that happiness is often too much for him, and needs must have violent expression. And St. Francis possessed that characteristic in an exceptional degree. But the freedom and the joy of the Mystic are given him for very practical purposes. They are the accompaniments of his heroism and his real love of adventure. In other words, they are the chief part of his equipment as a soldier in the forefront of the battle of Redemption. Of all men on the earth the Mystic lives least for himself. He has emptied himself of self in order that he may be filled with God. He is filled with God in order that he may "work the works of God"—that is, in order that he may take his full share in the work of Redemption. "To the Mystic who is passionately desirous of God it must often seem that a life of comparative contentment, a life in which necessaries are at hand and nothing is very far to

seek, when one day follows another with a regular placidity, is the least desirable condition possible. He is by his nature anxious for opportunities to prove his devotion, anxious for a chance of showing his unfailing love for God by letting it burn undiminished in the midst of difficulties and darkness. He would be in agreement with the writer of the *Theologica Germanica* (ch. xi.) that man is safe either in the hell or the heaven of life, but that in any intermediate state he is most dangerously placed."* The Mystic has the temperament of a soldier or of a mountaineer, and his very exaggerations are necessary. For, after all, a whizz-bang is an exaggeration, and so are Chicago, Johannesburg, and Mount Everest. The exaggeration of evil cannot be adequately met by the tameness of the good.

St. Francis showed to the full the Mystic's need for solitude, as Thomas of Celano has already told us. Certainly at one definite time in his life he felt a real desire for release from an active life and the adoption of a life of uninterrupted contemplation. As time went on the need for longer periods of retirement seem to have shown themselves. Directly, these were a preparation for the reception of the Stigmata: indirectly, they represented the constant desire of the Mystic to be alone with God.

Having now, perhaps, said enough to establish our thesis that it is as a Mystic that St. Francis is primarily to be regarded, is it possible to go on and establish the degree of Mystical Prayer to which he attained? Father Poulain, in his great work,† based directly on the writings of the most eminent Mystics, gives four states of purely Mystical Prayer: (1) Prayer of Quiet; (2) Prayer of Union; (3) Ecstasy; (4) Spiritual Marriage, in which he follows St. Teresa of Spain, pointing out that the Ursuline Venerable Mary of the Incarnation amalgamates Union and Ecstasy and so gives three states only, while St. John of the Cross simplifies still further, and regards the degrees as two only: (1) The Spiritual Marriage or Transforming Union; (2) all that leads up to it. In what is admittedly a very difficult subject, the difficulty may very easily be increased if these degrees are too much regarded as set and habitual. Our metaphor of a mountaineer may again help us here, especially as writers on Mysticism are fond of describing their experience as an ascent. Devoted to his strange craft—as it appears to most—the mountaineer gladly undergoes the hardships he knows are incidental to it from sheer love of the mountains and their manifold and indescribable joys. Yet it is only on

* *The Mysticism of St. Francis of Assisi*, by D. S. H. Nicholson, a book to which the writer owes a real debt. It is eminently suggestive, but a Catholic would not agree with some of its conclusions.

† *The Graces of Interior Prayer*, p. 53.

rare occasions, maybe, that it will be granted to him, after the toil and danger of mastering some lofty and difficult peak, to taste the full joys of the magnificent prospect to be seen from it on a perfect day. So it may only be on occasions that the Mystic may, after having become expert in the climbing, be granted the boon of the full prospect. What the Transposing Union is like—or something of what it is like, for the whole simply could not be expressed—St. John of the Cross* has described in these words: "The soul by resigning itself becomes immediately enlightened by and transformed in God; because He communicates His own supernatural Being in such a way that the soul seems to be God Himself and to possess the things of God. Such a union is then wrought when God bestows on the soul that supreme grace which makes the things of God and the soul one by the transformation which renders the one a partaker of the other; the soul seems to be God rather than itself, and indeed is God by participation, though in reality preserving its own natural substance as distinct from God as it did before, although transformed in Him, as the window preserves its substance distinct from the rays of the sun shining through it and making it light."

The Prayer of Ecstasy, to go back to St. Teresa's classification, is accompanied by visible manifestations. The ecstatic is oblivious of all around him: he is completely held by his prayer. Sometimes the phenomenon of Levitation is an accompaniment to this state of prayer, and it is recorded by Brother Leo, who went with St. Francis to Mount Alverna, that he saw him sometimes lifted to a man's height from the ground, sometimes much higher.† Further, the gift of the Stigmata is an accompaniment to this state of prayer. St. Francis was the first to receive the gift. Since his time Dr. Imbert,‡ who has made a thorough study of the subject, reckons no less than 321 known cases, and thinks there are several more unknown. Of these twenty-nine persons lived in the nineteenth century. The record of one of the most recent, Gemma Galgani (1878-1903) has been most carefully put out by her director, Father Germanus, C.P.,§ and both he and Dr. Imbert have very fully investigated the whole subject of Stigmatization.

It must be admitted, then, that St. Francis had attained to at least the degree of Ecstasy. Had he attained to the fullest degree of Mystical Prayer? If we remember how St. Gertrude the Great was told by our Lord that He was only too desirous of giving the fullest gifts of prayer to all who would prepare

* *Spiritual Canticle*, Stanza xxii., line 1, p. 119.
† *Vie de St. François*, by Chalippe, bk. iv., quoted by Poulain, *op. cit.*, p. 171.
‡ *La Stigmatization.* § *Life of Gemma Galgani.*

themselves for their reception; if we remember how St. Teresa was always urging her spiritual daughters to make themselves ready for the higher degrees; and if we remember the utter devotion of St. Francis to our Lord, there can surely be little question of his attainment to the highest degree. Mr. Nicholson has done good service to lovers of St. Francis by putting together the evidence that he did so attain. We have only space here to summarize it, and must refer those who wish to pursue the subject further to his book. We have already quoted Thomas of Celano as saying that "walking, sitting, eating, or drinking, he was intent on prayer." Bonaventure, one of his earliest disciples, says: "He yearned to be utterly transformed into Him by the fire of his exceeding love." And St. Francis himself thus prays to God: "Almighty, eternal, just, and merciful God, give to us wretches to do for Thee what we know Thee to will, and to will always that which is pleasing to Thee: so that inwardly purified, inwardly illumined and kindled by the flame of the Holy Ghost, we may be able to follow in the footsteps of Thy Son our Lord Jesu Christ, and by Thy grace may come to Thee the Most High." As Mr. Nicholson justly remarks: "The prayer is a short résumé of the whole mystical process." And we are in possession of another prayer of St. Francis, his wonderful paraphrase of the *Pater Noster*—too long to quote here, but given by Mr. Nicholson—which must surely convince the reader that God's highest gift was not withheld from His humble and most faithful servant.

We may, in conclusion, ask ourselves what special thing we owe to the mysticism of St. Francis. He was so many-sided, and touched life at so many points, that the question is not easy to answer. To every Mystic we owe the deepening of the sense of God and His Providence. To St. Francis we owe a literal reliving of the life of our Blessed Lord Himself in many of its most important aspects. But perhaps two things emerge as special contributions made by St. Francis: (1) The sense of the value of detachment through his enthusiastic love for poverty; (2) the sense of the essential solidarity of the whole of Creation as the work of God. At a time when there is much talk of "self-expression," and of "betterment" in the sense of a multiplication of wants and an accumulation of the power to satisfy them, it may be that we specially need the reminder that the life of man does not consist in the multitude of his possessions. At a time when Nature is being extensively chained for the service of man, and is apt to be regarded merely as existing for his convenience and comfort, it may be that stress needs to be laid upon the direct dependence of Nature on God. At a time when a Natural Science has arisen which

seems to gravitate naturally towards Materialism and to banish God from Nature, it is not without profit that we should be reminded of the God Who is immanent in Nature. The two notable poems, the Canticle of the Sun and the Hymn of the Praises of the Creatures, the fruit of his ripe age and deep mystical experience, may well be counted as among the richest and most important gifts the Little Poor Man has bequeathed to a needy world.

R. Ll. Langford-James, D.D.

FRANCISCAN POVERTY

Our generation has committed itself to some kind of attempt at the imitation of St. Francis. Since Paul Sabatier published his famous Life of the saint and the early compilation known as the *Mirror of Perfection* there has been a rapid succession of books, translations of the old legends, new lives and studies. St. Francis lives again in the imagination of all and various, from the Pope himself down to the heretics, schismatics, and even secularists of every country. The same thing has happened with the Master Himself. "The quest of the historical Jesus" has not been confined to the literary criticism of the New Testament. The late Dr. Sanday declared that more Lives of our Lord had been written in the nineteenth century than at any other period of Church history. Men have not been content to look on while the learned discussed Mark and "Q." They have demanded to know what Christ was like, and they have been attracted to follow in His steps.

The war made many of us very uncomfortable who had talked loudest of the imitation of Christ. We found that we had not faced the Sermon on the Mount, and had not decided on the practical meaning of forgiveness or love of our enemies.

Something of the same kind is happening with regard to St. Francis. Carried away with the enthusiasm which resulted from our renewed study of Franciscan literature, we have declared our intention of imitating the saint, a little carelessly perhaps. Certainly, as we look at the world of the present day, it seems at first sight an absurd proposal. But, to begin with, however impossible it appears, it has got to be attempted if it is good. To have seen the highest, whether in our Lord or in St. Francis of seven hundred years ago, is to have before us an ideal which somehow or other has got to be pursued. Then it is well to get rid of the notion that imitation must mean a slavish

attempt to copy without any discrimination due to the difference between ourselves and our ideal, and to the differences of period and circumstance. In the case of our Lord, of course, it is so obvious that it admits of no discussion, but what about St. Francis? Was he not a mere man? Can we not imitate him literally? Father Tyrrell, drawing a contrast between the literalists and the friars in *Lex Credendi*, writes: "The Puritan copies an ancient masterpiece: St. Francis is inspired by it to yield new results."* So with our modern attempts at Franciscanism, it would be foolish, or at any rate inadequate, to adopt the "Rule and Life of the Brethren and Sisters of Penitence" (the Third Order). That would simply mean yet another Church Society or Guild, and would fall flat if it were ever actually set up. St. Francis himself disliked making any Rule. Mr. G. K. Chesterton in his pre-Roman days dared to write that the Founder of the Franciscan Order "was only one, perhaps a minor one, of the things that he was." It is quite true. He was an inspirer rather than a founder. He called upon all Christians to follow Christ.

Poverty was the distinguishing mark of the early disciples. The mark had become obliterated. Poverty had been living in widowhood since the Gospel days. She must be brought out again as a bride for the Church to marry. But this was to be done not only by a few monks and nuns of the old type taking a vow inside cells remote from humanity. Such poverty might become mere selfishness. St. Francis pitched his tent among men. He would be poor with all men or not at all. Those who could not live exactly as the friars did must do their best in their own homes. But poverty must mark the life. Obviously that would mean the spirit of poverty embodied in various ways, and so it must mean to all who would follow the saint. Franciscan poverty does not mean shirking the society of human beings. In these days it means that somehow or other we have got to face the modern commercial system with its ramifications of finance, and all that goes to make up what we call "civilization," and yet be poor. If poverty is, as St. Francis maintained, the essential Christian thing, then it must be possible "with God" even in the twentieth century.

Let us consider the spirit of poverty. Why are the poor in spirit blessed? Why is the Kingdom of Heaven theirs?

If we take the "Kingdom of Heaven" to mean "the spiritual companionship of all those who would follow the Son of Man in living under the Rule of the loving Father and King," then the "world" as "human society organizing itself apart from God" must be its exact antithesis. Our Lord gathers His

* *Lex Credendi*, p. 53.

disciples round Him to reveal to them the mystery of the Kingdom. They are to join with Him in bringing it down from Heaven. The Beatitudes describe the essential character which must belong to those who with Him shall bring in the Kingdom, and the first and fundamental mark is poverty.

St. Francis, without writing this down in a Rule with detailed particulars and penalties, simply gave himself to God, and found it at once dominating his life. He was strictly original and dared to be himself. But it was a self utterly surrendered to God and dependent on God, and that is a self that is poor in spirit. The Friars were God's beggars. They threw themselves upon God's providence, and trusted Him like children for all and with their all. There is in St. Francis a gradual development of all that poverty meant. It begins with the ideal of a bride that he will marry. She fascinates him. He cannot tell anyone or even himself all that she means. She is fairer than all. She is the pearl of great price that he must have at all costs. A poet and an artist and an actor, he cannot help making a dramatic scene outside the Bishop's house when he strips himself naked and repudiates his father. He goes away into the woods and mountains to meditate on all that has happened. God is his Father now. The idea of poverty grows out of that stupendous fact. If God is our Father, then we are all brothers and sisters. I am in a great Home. The whole world of nature is God's family.

Birds and wolves, sun and moon, death itself are brothers and sisters too. A new life opens out before him. He can no longer live unto himself. The poor priests with their ruined chapels, symbolic of a fallen Church, must be comforted and encouraged by the rebuilding of their sanctuaries. The lepers from whom he had shrunk with distaste in his boyhood must now be tended, even kissed. The robbers he meets must be treated as human brothers. " Children of the devil " to-day, they will be found to be " children of God " to-morrow. Nothing in the Father's great Home must pass him unnoticed or unloved. " He never forgot to take pleasure in a bird as it flashed by him, or a drop of water as it fell from his finger." There is some good even in the cruel wolf of Gubbio. He must have been hungry, or he would not have committed these depredations. He shall be fed daily in future, so that he suffer not hunger any more. St. Francis is born again, a little child very great in the Kingdom of Heaven, a poor little naked baby stripped of all that is artificial and worldly and conventional. He begins life again in the heavenly home, and cries out to the rest of humanity to join him.

" O how holy and glorious and great it is to have a Father

in Heaven," says the saint in his *Letter to all Christians*. "Let us love God and adore Him with a pure heart and a pure mind, because He Himself, seeking this above all things, says: The true adorers shall adore the Father in spirit and in truth. Let us say to Him praises and prayers both day and night, saying, Our Father which art in Heaven: because we ought always to pray and not to faint."

It passes comprehension how some historians of the nineteenth century could see little in St. Francis but fanaticism and an unbalanced mind. It is the world that is mad, not the little poor man who goes on his way rejoicing. Together the friars grow up, a new race in the world, not of it, a company that does not want to "get," but to "be."

All the rest of the Beatitudes spring from this first foundation in poverty. Having given themselves irrevocably independence on God, they are "meek," facing the world unruffled, silent like our Lord in His Passion, not because He has no answer to the world, but because His mind is on God and God alone, and He is Himself the answer, the Word made Flesh; "merciful" because their hearts go out in expansive love and pity to others whom they now love with the love of God; "mourners" because they cannot help being serious in view of the tragedy of life looked at with the eyes of God, weeping with God's tears over the sin that has broken up the family home; "hungering and thirsting after righteousness," never satisfied until the will of God is done on earth as they know it is being done in heaven, where they already are; "pure in heart" because they are serving God with a single heart; full of joy, the joy of being unselfish, the joy of knowing that they are on the side of God, ready, as St. Francis said to his companion, to be turned out of doors and left in the cold and beaten for His sake. They are one great family, and with the birds and beasts, the trees and the young lions, "they do seek their meat from God."

Or look at Franciscan poverty again in the light of the story of the early Church. How exactly the same results follow the surrender of St. Francis as came upon the disciples with the descent of the Holy Spirit.

His sons and his daughters prophesy; the young men see visions and the old men dream dreams: "All that believed were together, and had all things common: and they sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all according as any man had need. And day by day . . . breaking bread at home, they did take their food with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God and having favour with all the people." "Neither was among them any that lacked: for as many as

were possessors of lands or houses sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold and laid them at the apostles' feet: and distribution was made unto each according as anyone had need."

This might be a description of the famous "Chapter of Mats," or a record of a meeting of the Third Order.

Jacques de Vitry, a French prelate, writing in his diary in 1216, describes the Brothers Minor in Perugia as he saw them: "They live after the manner of the primitive Church of whom it is written, 'the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul.' During the day they go into the towns and villages to win souls, and to work. At night they resort to hermitages or lonely places to give themselves up to contemplation."

Tens of thousands rose up to follow St. Francis and his friars, and the greatest revival (in the strict sense of the word) resulted that the Church has ever known.

Now it is revival that we are looking for in all Christian countries. It has been pointed out by many writers that St. Francis came into a changing world where feudalism was breaking down, and a "desire for freedom in which the developing spirit of man was to find new and undreamed of expressions was asserting itself." To this he gave a "deep spiritual quality," which without him (humanly speaking) it would have lacked.* This gives special significance to the study of St. Francis now. Revivalism before the war meant evangelistic missions at which individual souls gave themselves to Christ, and in many cases, no doubt, lived lives of deep piety thereafter. But for some years, in this country at least, earnest people have desired something more than this. It has been felt that Christ came to do more than pluck a minority of individual souls from hell, that He came to establish a new social order to overcome the world. This has been the underlying aspiration of all "Christian Social" movements. "The Kingdom of God" for which our Lord taught us to pray has become, in a vague sense often but yet in all seriousness, an ideal in the minds of a large number of the very people in whom this new desire for self-expression is most potent. The new eschatological explanations of parts of the New Testament have not satisfied that craving. We cannot doubt that the Holy Spirit has been guiding men to what is sometimes called, somewhat disparagingly, a "Kingdom-Christianity."

We came back from the war demanding a "new spirit," and we have been seeking for it ever since. Now comes the

* Dobson, *Little Poor Man of Assisi*, chap. xi. See also Creighton's *Historical Lectures and Addresses*, pp. 69-98.

seven hundredth anniversary of an outpouring of a new spirit on a multitude who had similar aspirations. Here is the same desire for freedom and self-expression on the part of masses of young men. Can St. Francis give again that " deep spiritual quality " which such a desire always needs if it is to be rightly satisfied ?

It is complained that the young are ceasing to attend Church services, and it is too true that the number of Ordinands is decreasing. Business men who honestly desire to apply their religion are in despair. It was pathetic to hear of such men waiting for the meetings of C.O.P.E.C., hoping that the conferences would give them a lead. The Labour Movement is less religious than it was, yet it still looks to the Church for help, and welcomes the least sign of our willingness to sympathize with its aspirations. It is said that the young are peculiarly frivolous and critical of their elders, but have not the elders always said this of each succeeding generation ? It is said that financial considerations deter our youth from seeking Holy Orders, but can we feel satisfied that this is an explanation ? The friars would have come to a dead stop if they had let that stand in the way. Nor is the intellectual difficulty a satisfactory explanation. We do not want, indeed, to disparage " learning " in St. Francis' way, but we could well dispense with much of the cold intellectualism which damps the enthusiasm of many. The real reason for this lamentable state of things is in the Church itself, which fails to give the young a " use for religion." Some of the best boys and girls are not being helped in their ordinary life by religion as they see it. Religion as an incentive, a motive, and an inspiration is diminishing.

Of course, we cannot at will raise a St. Francis to inspire us. He will come if God intends to work that way. What we can do is to study our saint, and to form ourselves into groups who will pray that we may imbibe his spirit. Groups of Christians living a Gospel life, not advertising themselves, but content to pursue the highest as they see it, will act upon the world and draw men out to follow him. A Third Order will come, not organized by a committee or patronized by Bishops, but gathered by the Holy Ghost. Kindred spirits would find each other out, share lodgings, or meet of an evening after work. They would not be in a hurry to start clubs or do " social work " among the poor. They would primarily cultivate a Christian home life. The suburbs are teeming with young men and women living rather lonely lives as regards religion. It is from such that the groups would come. They would be joined together by a mutual desire to know what religion offers, and to place them-

selves at the disposal of Christ's Church if, and when, it showed that it wanted them.

In the Gospels and the Acts we cannot help noting that in taking up with Christ and His Church the disciples felt that they were entering upon a new life in which sacrifice would be demanded. Whatever the Kingdom of God actually meant, it was a tremendous idea of which they became aware (as Mr. Clutton Brock used to say). It meant being off with the old love and on with a new. Christ discouraged any falterers who were not prepared for a gigantic change. They must not look back, they must give up all, they must be ready to cut themselves off from home ties, they must have no earthly ambitions, they must make a plunge into deep waters, and be baptized with a baptism and drink of a cup.

It was little less that St. Francis demanded. His was the call of Christ by one who had obeyed it himself. Is the call of the modern Church at all like this? Does any Confirmation candidate feel that, as he approaches the day of the laying on of hands or his first Communion, he is committing himself to a life of a very different and exacting kind? Does he, as a matter of fact, pass into a new family circle where sacrifice and fellowship are common to all, where there is something like the unity of the first disciples, where he would not be surprised to find himself compelled by a spirit that bade him do some act such as St. Barnabas or St. Paul did? Is not the Church exceedingly like the world around him with its conventions, its foolish fashions, its respectability, and its dulness? When he goes to a missionary meeting or a service, is there much that even interests him, much less inspires him to give up all for Christ?

The Franciscan spirit in these groups would mean a new sacrificial atmosphere into which a convert would inevitably come. Until he had made the plunge, the Church would be like a foreign country on the shores of which he had just arrived, but which at present he had not explored. He would be waiting with keen interest to begin. The very prospect of difficulty and suffering would be part of the attraction.

This kind of attractive strangeness, this mysterious atmosphere whose presence we know, but which, until we have made a venture, we know we do not share, should belong to the whole Church as contrasted with the world. But it can only be made a reality by the gathering together of small groups with a very definite determination to make it real within a small area. Their ideal will be one that in imagination they see by faith already realized in the whole community: Class distinctions broken down, wars of classes or nations a thing of the past, fellowship in industry and every department of human life,

honour for all men, and, above all, unity amongst all followers of Christ. These are only some of the ideals that would move them to activity. There is still an atmosphere of riches which chokes Christ's word and turns earth into hell. Poverty would disperse that and bring Christians together as those who could be depended upon for justice, sympathy, brotherliness, and mercy at whatever cost to themselves. As it is, we very often find that men are quite surprised when Christians do the most obvious and ordinary good deeds of self-sacrifice.

The imitation, then, of St. Francis is not to be brought about by waiting for some great leader to arise, nor by any attempt to copy exactly his methods, nor by the establishment of a new community on the precise lines of the friars or the Third Order. Rather it is to be done by the coming together from any quarter of the Church of those who are prepared to be poor in whatever way is open to them.

Poverty in the sense of simplicity of life, sacrificial sharing with others, unselfish and conscientious expenditure, voluntary privation for the sake of giving assistance, are possible for most people—even for those not very rich. In the case of rich men, big sacrifices might be more common than they are, especially anonymous ones. This would be Franciscan. So would expenditure on a business which gave most benefit to the workers and least to the employer. So would restriction in the matter of luxury.

The life of these new friars would be very happy. The followers of St. Francis seem always to have been in the highest of spirits.

The world with its *ennui* and its stupidity (such as Mr. G. F. Watts depicted on the face of "Mammon") would appear decidedly inferior to the Kingdom of God.

Poverty is rather a remedy for the disease of covetousness than food for a healthy world. If we all knew how to be rich, there would be less need for so drastic a remedy. Poverty is a spiritual healing of a world suffering from avarice, which it will not even confess. St. Francis did not embrace poverty as a *pis aller* or drink its cup, making a face as if it were nasty. To him riches were the real misfortune of life. Poverty was the positive joy. It was the freedom of birds and flowers. Undoubtedly these "new poor" of the twentieth century must look and really be happy over it, if they are to be Franciscan. They must be able to provide something attractive by its very venturesomeness.

Their life must be sparkling with the irresponsibility of children out for a spiritual spree in their Father's home. At present the Church circle, though it has lost the dour grimness of

Puritanism, is not particularly joyous or inspiring. A Parochial Church Council, or a Ruri-Decanal Conference, or a District Visitors' conclave—even a Bishop's Garden Party—would compare unfavourably with the "Chapter of Mats" when it came to attracting a youth of our time who wanted to know what to expect if he gave in to the Church.

A Sergeant-Major going "over the top" said to the Padre: "This ain't no blooming Mothers' Meeting, is it?" In a sense, a Mothers' Meeting that bore some resemblance to going "over the top" would be a hopeful sign of progress in an English parish. Christian mothers ready to fight for and sacrifice themselves for their children that they might be brought to Christ might make things "hum."

To sum up. Though we British folk are not very likely to copy literally either St. Francis, who led, or the friars and Tertiaries, who followed, yet it is quite possible that the love we have for the Gospel story and the hatred of hypocrisy which makes us unwilling to go on repeating creeds about our Master's Person while neglecting His teaching, may in God's good time produce leaders of a Franciscan type, and followers who, drawn by them along the same path, will revive the Church among the English-speaking races.

JAMES ADDERLEY.

TWO NOTES ON ST. FRANCIS

THE FRANCISCAN GREETING

ST. FRANCIS writes in his Testament: "A salutation the Lord revealed to me, that we should say *Dominus det tibi pacem.*" In the *Three Companions* it is stated (c. viii.) that he always gave this salutation at the beginning of his sermons to the people, and in both recensions of the Speculum we find the story of the Brother, one of the first Twelve, who asked to be allowed to give another greeting as this one was so new and strange (Sp. *L* 6=Sp. *S* 26).

The age in which St. Francis lived was the age in which Italian passed from being Vulgar Latin into the first of the Modern Languages. St. Francis himself in the *Canticum Solis* is one of the first creators of Italian poetry, and I cannot help wondering whether the Franciscan Greeting was really composed of the syllables that we read in his Latin Testament. The authorities I have referred to above can all be understood to refer to a form of greeting, not in Latin but in Italian. What is the Italian for *Dominus det tibi pacem?*

I venture to suggest that the answer is to be found in the Old Italian version of the *Three Companions* first published by Melchiorri, and afterwards by Fathers Marcellino da Civezza and Teofilo Domenichelli (*La Leggenda*, etc., Rome, 1899, quoted as M.C.T.D.). In this work (p. 51) it is given as

Dio Signore te dia la pace.

Is it not significant that this is a perfectly rhythmical line, of the same scansion as the line employed by Dante? It should further be noted that in Sp. *L* 6 the first Brothers are said to have saluted the men and women in the roads and fields, saying *Dominus det tibi uel uobis pacem.* Now in Latin there is a good deal of difference between the rhythmical value of *tibi* (⏑ ⏒) and *uobis* (— —), but between *ti* and *vi* there is no difference at all.*

There is one story in the *Actus*—*i.e.*, the Latin original of the *Fioretti*—which not only introduces the Franciscan greeting, but even states that it was spoken in the vernacular. In *Actus* 3 (ed. Sabatier, p. 15), when Bernard of Quintavalle was far away in a foreign land on his way back from Santiago de Compostella, he was met by a youth—really an angel, as the sequel shows—who saluted him *idiomate proprio*, saying, *Deus*† *det tibi pacem, o bone frater!* Bernard, wondering at this salutation, given as it was in his own tongue, replies (of course, in Italian), *Unde te habeo, o bone iuucnis?* We turn to the *Fioretti* for a translation, and we find (*Fioretti* 4, ed. Manzoni, p. 15) for the greeting,

Iddio ti dia pace, o buono frate,

and for the reply,

Onde vieni tu, buono giovani?

Both these lines are of exactly the same scansion as *Dio Signore te dia la pace*, for of course "*pace o*" counts as two metrical syllables only, and "*Iddio*" may be scanned as two syllables as well as three.‡

The story just quoted from the *Actus* is important because the greeting is expressly said to have been in the vernacular. On the other hand, there were occasions when Francis would use Latin, or at least the popular imagination might suppose that he would use Latin. Such an occasion would certainly

* It must, of course, be noticed that the Italian translation of the *Testament*, published in *Palomes*, ii., 446, from "Flor. Pal. E. 5, 9, 84," a MS. written in 1396, has only *Dio ti dia pace.*

† So the Liège MS., in such matters always the best (see *Actus*, 9, 8; 33, 1).

‡ In Amoni's edition of the *Fioretti* the lines are *Iddio ti dia pace, o buon frate* and *Onde vieni tu, buon giovani?* The former can be scanned if we make *Iddio* three syllables, but the latter is unmetrical, for *giovani* has only two syllables.

be when in 1221 he visited the Pope on his return from the Orient and asked that Cardinal Ugolino might be Protector of the Order. This event is narrated to us by Jordan of Giano (S. 14), who says that Francis greeted the Pope with the words:

Pater Papa, Deus det tibi pacem.

Is it mere accident that this also has eleven syllables and the same rhythm as the Italian lines quoted above ?

The general inference I should like to draw from these tales is not, of course, that Dante imitated the Franciscan Greeting, but that we have in the tales, and especially in the Franciscan greeting itself, very early examples of the line chosen by Dante for his *Divina Commedia.*

BROTHER MASSEO AND JALĀLUDDĪN RŪMĪ

In *Actus* 41=*Fioretti* 32 we read of Brother Masseo, the companion of St. Francis, who had the grace of humble and holy enjoyment of the Divine Light. He was continually in a state of mental song. " And often when he was praying he used to make a continuous and uniform sound and with a low voice cooed like a dove—*u u u**—and so used to spend his time in contemplation with a cheerful and happy face, and being most humble about this used to consider himself the least of all men. James of Falerone, of blessed memory, asked him why he did not change the tune in his jubilee, but Masseo replied, with a great smile: ' Because when all good is found in one thing, it is not fitting that the tune should be changed.' "

Masseo of Marignano was said to have been tall and good-looking, and he was a devoted companion of St. Francis, but there is nothing to show that he had even a clerkly education, or anything whatever to do with Franciscan missions to the Orient. It may safely be affirmed that neither he, nor the editors of the *Fioretti* in any of its forms, had ever anything to do with Persian mysticism in general, or with the great poet of Persian mysticism in particular. Jalāluddīn Rūmī was born in A.D. 1207, and met with his spiritual master, Shamsi Tabriz, a wandering devotee, in 1244. To the memory of his master Jalāluddīn dedicated a volume of poems, known as the *Divan of Shamsi Tabriz.*† In No. VI., couplet 13, Jalāluddīn says: " The essence of the meaning of ' He ' (*i.e.*, the ineffable Unity that is God) has filled my heart and soul." The word for

* The Latin (*Actus*, p. 134) is: *Faciebat quemdam iubilum uniformem, et uoce obtusa faciebat quasi columbus u u u.*

† See *Selected Poems from the Divāni Shamsi Tabrīz*, by R. A. Nicholson (Cambridge, 1898).

"He" is not the Persian pronoun, but an adaptation of the Arabic pronoun, which is only used in Persian in this mystical sense. In sound it is the same, *oo* or *ow*, which is also used in Persian for the bark of a dog—*i.e.*, bow-*wow*. So Jalāluddīn goes non: "'Ow' cries the dog, and neither third nor second have I (to add to it)."

Cum in una re inuenitur omne bonum, non oportet quod uariet iubilum. Brother Masseo and Jalāluddīn were contemporaries, though their homes and conditions were far apart. They had never heard of one another, and they were enthusiastic adherents of different religions. But the identical form in which they felt that the highest truth was for them expressed is one of the most curious coincidences that I have ever come across.

F. C. Burkitt.

LANCELOT ANDREWES AND THE ENGLISH CHURCH

From the beginning of English Church reform the public and avowed principles were these:

1. The Scriptures as the final test of doctrine.
2. The appeal to antiquity and Catholic consent as the normal standard of interpreting Scripture.
3. The authority of the Church as arbiter in doctrinal controversies.
4. The power of the national Church to exercise discipline and to decree rites and ceremonies.

To say this is not to deny the operation, in the progress of reform, of other influences. Among these attention has been drawn to the increasing national restiveness under papal exactions, the economic inequalities caused by the wealth of monastic bodies, the political aspirations of awakened nationalism, the personal motives of the sovereigns, and, above all, the impact of the Continental Reformation which greatly complicated the problem of internal reform. But behind all these, and greater than any of them, was a spiritual revolution which had shaken Europe to its foundations, and from which nothing emerged exactly as it had been. Reconstruction was the universal necessity; and however important may have been the external influences at work, the ultimate form taken by each fragment of Western Christendom in its reconstruction was determined by the intellectual principles with which it had

identified itself in the process. In England these principles were derived from the Christian Renaissance as it had been interpreted to England by Colet and Erasmus.

When Queen Elizabeth came to the throne in 1558 it looked as if the kind of reformation implied in such principles was utterly impossible. The rapid declension of English reform towards a complete identification with Calvinism, which had been abruptly terminated by a violent reaction to the old religion, had inclined considerable sections of the country, on the one side and on the other, to believe that England must choose between Calvinism and Romanism. It was therefore through the courage and the tenacity of the Queen, and more particularly of the archbishop whom she chose to succeed Reginald Pole, that the original principles were reasserted as a bulwark against a return to Rome, on the one hand, and an imitation of the "best models of reformed churches abroad," on the other. By the gentleness and the rigour of Parker's administration, by his own words and example, and not least of all, by the type of scholarship which he chose to patronize, he succeeded in impressing his principles on those who, with him and after him, sought to apply them, and in applying them came more and more to believe in them. In the reign of Elizabeth nothing is more significant than the conversion of the episcopate to the distinctly Anglican position.

"We will proceed," wrote Parker, in his preface to the Bible, "in the reformation begun, and doubt not by the help of Christ His grace, of the true unity to Christ's Catholic Church, and of the uprightness of our faith in this province."

No greater disciple of this doctrine was raised up than Lancelot Andrewes, whose life extended throughout the reigns of Elizabeth and James I., whose friends included the greatest leaders in Church and State, whose genius commanded the admiration of friend and foe alike, and whose intellectual sympathies, as Dr. Ottley has remarked, were perhaps broader than those of any man in England. In his sermons, and in his controversial writings, he speaks as the interpreter of a movement that had reached maturity, after reconstruction had proceeded to a point which could justify a deliberate judgment; and in his devotions, for which he is perhaps best known, he voices a piety which had already been widely disseminated. He was primarily a preacher and teacher, and controversy was ever a thing which he undertook with dislike. His theology was always directed to the practical concerns of the inner life, and for this reason his emphasis upon Christian institutions is saved from the temper of mere ecclesiasticism.

We shall not be concerned with any detailed account of his teaching, but rather with three large aspects of it which serve to illustrate his position as an interpreter of the English Reformation and which may have in them some practical suggestions for ourselves. But before proceeding to this, it is of some importance to observe, as explaining somewhat the position occupied by Andrewes, certain matters that had been worked out to something like definiteness before the end of the sixteenth century:

1. The basis of authority had been sufficiently determined. For this the credit is due to Hooker, who, in repudiating the idea of a single source of authority, had (to quote Dr. Ottley again) " exhibited the complex nature of the ultimate authority on which a religious system must necessarily rest if it is to appeal to the whole of human nature." This authority, as Hooker defined it, resides in the Bible, in the universal witness of the Church, and in human reason. In the Bible is contained God's revelation, and in the interpretation of this the individual reason is guided by deference to what the Church has always believed. This witness of the Church exercises a claim on men both historic and moral, and, following the line taken by Hooker, Andrewes uses a striking phrase in which he says that " the Church is the pillar of the truth, a pillar that hangs not in mid-air, but has its basis and foundation in Scripture."

2. The systematic defence of episcopacy, called forth by the Puritan agitation in favour of the Holy Discipline, had made it clear that the Church retained episcopacy in principle, and not simply as a civil expedient for exercising Crown supervision. For example, Sir Francis Knollys, a typical conforming Puritan, had attacked Whitgift's assertion of episcopal theory on the ground that it detracted from the royal supremacy; but " he was brought to a quieter frame of mind by a rebuke from the queen, whose rights he fancied himself to be defending."

3. The Royal Supremacy was defined, and in that definition accepted by the Crown, in such a way as to preserve the spiritual integrity of the Church. It was believed to restore to the State precisely those powers which the temporal power of the Papacy had sought to alienate, and was largely based on the principle that ecclesiastical persons and property cannot be exempted from the sovereignty of the nation. But, within the sphere of spiritual authority, it was made quite clear that the Sovereign possessed no power to " touch sacred things " as Andrewes put it—that is to say, no sacerdotal power—nor any to decree rites and ceremonies or to confer Order. The authority of the State was to uphold by the secular arm what the Church taught.

4. There had been a steady revival of piety moulded by the use of the Prayer-Book. Old churches were being restored and new ones built. In 1610, when deprivations were made for nonconformity, it was found, contrary to confident Puritan prophecies, that comparatively few of the clergy were obdurate, and those chiefly among the senior men ordained in Grindal's time.

In this revival of English religion lay the preparation for a revolt against Calvinism that came to full expression at the end of the sixteenth century, and the material of a more consistent Churchmanship, waiting only for the moulding hand of a man like Andrewes to formulate principles and to stimulate devotion. He was, in the happy phrase which a modern writer has used of St. Francis de Sales, a " naturalist of souls "; and in the sweeping influence which he exercised, from the Court downward, by his many deep friendships, by his excellence as a confessor and spiritual physician, and particularly by his preaching, he effected, or at least brought to articulation, a profound change in contemporary thought. The nature of this change is the first of the three aspects of his teaching which we propose to examine.

I

The earlier conflicts with Puritanism had centred mainly in matters of church order and the underlying question of the sole authority of Scripture. But the defeat of Cartwright in this field by Whitgift and Hooker had not by any means unseated other and more important principles of Calvinism. It was not till 1595 that signs of a thorough-going revolt made their appearance. In that year a sermon was preached at Cambridge which made a bold onslaught on the doctrines of assurance and the indefectibility of faith. The Regius Professor, Whitaker, immediately replied in a set of nine theses in which he reasserted the most extreme Calvinism. These he presented to the primate; and in the practically unrevised form in which they became known as the Lambeth Articles, they were sponsored by Whitgift for incorporation in the Church's formularies. It is a striking proof of the intellectual power of Calvinism that the archbishop who had most valiantly repulsed it in some of its phases should now have been found willing to graft it, in its worst form, on the English Church. But the religion of Geneva had reached its high-water mark, and was already ebbing: for although Barrett, the preacher of the iconoclastic sermon, abandoned its defence by a sudden adherence to Romanism after he had been forced at Cambridge to recant, his position was at once taken up by Baro, the Lady

Margaret professor, and by Andrewes and Overall. Baro publicly criticized the theses in a sermon at St. Mary's, and Andrewes attacked them in detail in a courageous letter to Whitgift. The archbishop soon became aware (and it has been said, not altogether to his disappointment) that the new opinion at Cambridge reflected the Queen's views, and that the religious mind of the country was daily growing more sympathetic, and he therefore abandoned the Articles. That the Cambridge revolution had struck at the psychological hour was speedily apparent in the spread of Andrewes's views and influence, and in the extraordinary popularity of his sermons.

We shall not venture on a discussion of the extent to which Calvinism was heretical, and here we shall be following Andrewes, who, indeed, once said that "the Puritans are sufficiently orthodox." The trouble with Calvinism, after all, was that it diverted religious thought into ultimately futile channels, by a wrong doctrinal preoccupation. The central idea upon which it revolved was the Divine sovereignty, and its primary interest was absorbed by the problem of the nature and operation of grace. In its system, the Person and work of Christ came, very subtly, perhaps, but really, to occupy a place *in* the system rather than *at its centre*. The engrossing concern of Christans, as may be seen from the very subject of Barrett's sermon and the forensic debate which followed it like the tail of a comet, was with questions more properly psychological and philosophical than religious.

The fatal mistake came from construing the fatherhood of God through His kingship, of thinking of Him as He is in Himself, in the mystery of His attributes and the inscrutability of His purposes, rather than as He is revealed in the face of Jesus Christ. In its treatment of the problem of grace Calvinism reaped a barren harvest from the past, and illustrated with peculiar force an evil tendency in religion. The problem exists, and always will exist, because it is involved in religious experience with an overwhelming sense of the priority and initiative of God. Here grace is but another word for love, and it is irresistible just because it is the vivid personal impression of the Divine nature upon the soul that has been awakened to receive it. However the mystic may describe his sense of selflessness, there is not, if one may put it so, enough space left between his soul and God for grace to lose its warmth of personality. Surely this is why theology, if it was faithfully to reflect experience, was bound to call the Spirit "Persona" (in the sense of Tertullian) in order that no abstraction might intervene between the soul and God. For the Christian mystic does not think of himself here, and God there, with grace super-

vening to bridge the chasm; with St. Paul he conceives grace as God's free gift of Himself by an indwelling Presence. But unhappily the whole conception easily falls to a lower level on which the necessity for spiritual attainment is left out by the neglect of the indwelling power of God for sanctification, and the operation of grace, as a consequence, comes to be regarded as impersonal, mechanical, and arbitrary. Whether the cause be a too exclusive emphasis on the Sacraments or an absorbing speculation regarding the action of Divine Providence, it denotes, in the one case as in the other, a lack of attention to the Person of Christ and the extension of His Life in the individual soul.

Wisely perceiving this, Andrewes endeavoured to bring men to think afresh about Christ, and by concentrating their minds on the significance of His Incarnation, His Passion, and His Resurrection, to stimulate emotions that had become atrophied and awake aspirations that had been parched. In one of his sermons on the Passion there is a sentence which epitomizes his preaching. He desired to bring men to look on Christ, "Him to behold and never to be satisfied with looking on Him." He was convinced that when we have learned the "law of sonship" through the Incarnation, when we have gazed on Calvary with love and hope, when we have found in the Resurrection the assurance of victory over the First Death, which is sin, and the Second, which is mortality, we shall be prepared to find grace welling up in us by the devout use of the Church's sacraments and the sincere acceptance of the duties of the Christian life. After all, as he said, it is impenitence and not predestined reprobation that brings the loss of the soul, "As though all our lifetime we believed the *permission* of sins . . . and the article of *remission* of sins never till the point of death."

This, therefore, is one of the great debts which the Anglican Church owes to Bishop Andrewes: that in a difficult and critical time he pointed people away from being occupied with abstractions that do not profit, to a living union with the ascended Redeemer. In giving a new direction to personal religion, at the same time Catholic and Evangelical, he most clearly reflected the intention of the Prayer-Book, which is a document that has not always elicited the enthusiastic admiration of the clergy, but has been an incalculably potent incentive to the devotion of the laity. The temper, moreover, which he imparted to English religion sank deeply enough to inspire directly, though in different ways, the two greatest movements in the English Church since the Reformation, for, through William Law, the influence of Andrewes passed directly both to John Wesley and to the Tractarians.

II

We come now to the second point on which Andrewes interpreted and crystallized the principles of the Reformation —namely, in regard to the papal supremacy.

As a result of the Gunpowder Plot the Government had imposed an oath expressly repudiating the doctrine that princes deposed by the Pope may be deposed or murdered by their subjects. The archpriest Blackwell had given the opinion that English Roman Catholics might in conscience subscribe the oath, but his decision had been formally reversed by a papal brief dated September, 1606. Blackwell disregarded this document on the ground that it was a forgery. Unfortunately, however, for him, it was followed in the next year by a second brief confirming it, and censuring those who had disregarded it. There came, also, a letter to Blackwell from Cardinal Bellarmine, the "undefeated Goliath" of revived Romanism on the Continent, in which occurs the significant phrase:

> "Most certain it is that the oath tends to this end, that the authority of the head of the Church in England may be transferred from the successor of St. Peter to the successor of King Henry VIII."

The consequence of this was a debate, lasting some years, first between King James and the cardinal, and afterward, when the King had shot his bolt, between Andrewes and the cardinal. James had declared himself a Catholic, and his adversary had retorted that no one could make this claim who denied Transubstantiation, the Invocation of Saints, and the Temporal Power of the Pope. Quite clearly, then, post-Tridentine Romanism was prepared to stand or fall by the absolute identification of the Catholic Faith with the developed theory and practice of the Western Church, and by an undiminished insistence on the principles of the bull *Unam Sanctam*. Thus the question was inevitably driven back on the spiritual supremacy of Rome with its consequences both for the theory of the Church and for the basis of secular government.

Fortunately the man who, in replying to Rome on behalf of the English Church, performed the more valuable function of interpreting the English Church to itself, was able to speak from a position of conceded authority which few Anglicans have enjoyed. When Andrewes spoke for his Church he could sincerely claim that his own settled convictions were derived from membership in a body that had attained some measure of critical self-consciousness which enabled it to view its own position without an excessive regard to foreign centres of

reform. And here it is of the utmost importance to observe that the Anglican position, so far as it concerned the papal claims, was formulated by Andrewes with reference, not to obsolete abuses, but to the system reformed and revived by the Council of Trent.

"We are," he says, "not innovators but renovators," and this is particularly true of his contention that the English Reformation had reversed the process of many centuries by restoring to the episcopate its inherent independence—an independence which the papacy had succeeded in subverting both in theory and practice. Certainly, the Roman Church had always enjoyed an ecclesiastical pre-eminence, and this, it is worth noticing, Andrewes is at no pains to deny. By a process, the stages of which it is not difficult to trace, this pre-eminence had been crystallized, in the West, into a sovereignty which practically dissolved the original episcopal constitution of the Church. We may say roughly that from the fifth to the eleventh century the Roman See developed its primacy along patriarchal lines, by the extension of its missions, by the superiority of many of its customs, by its influence as arbiter in the disputes between bishops and their Metropolitans. The quarrel over Investiture brought into prominence a new feature and, ending as it did with the subjection of ecclesiastics to an ecclesiastical overlord, gave an ineradicably feudal character to the relation between Pope and bishops. So great a transformation in the practical order of the Church could not but induce an episcopal theory of its own colour; and theologians were not slow to reassert the opinion of Jerome that there is an essential identity of bishops and presbyters. When the Council of Trent met, one of its chief problems was to deal with the status of bishops; but while it greatly reformed abuses of episcopal pluralities and non-residence, it succumbed, over the protest of the Spanish bishops, to the thesis of the eloquent Lainez, who argued that bishops are the successors of the apostles only mediately through the successors of Peter, and that the divine right of the episcopate is derived by extension of the only proper episcopate resident in the papal chair.

We are, therefore, not surprised to hear from Bellarmine that "all bishops receive their jurisdiction from no other source than the Pope," and again, "the jurisdiction of bishops descends from the Pope, in whom all jurisdiction resides." This, of course, by no means implies that bishops derive their *order* from the Pope, for obviously they derived this by consecration from other bishops. But when, in an attempt to safeguard himself, the Cardinal remarks that "the Pope is not universal bishop, in the sense that he alone is a bishop and others not

bishops, but his vicars," the question naturally presents itself: "In what way, then, *is* the Pope *universal* bishop?" Obviously for two reasons, as the Council of Trent plainly recognized: first, because, the plenitude of jurisdiction being his, the possession of episcopal orders is in itself only a qualification for admitting a man to the vicarious exercise of a certain portion of that jurisdiction; and secondly, because, if St. Peter was Christ's vicar to teach and to govern, his successors in exercising directly the supreme episcopal office of the Lord Himself possess it with a plenitude not shared by the apostles or their successors. The full significance of such a theory can be seen when it is compared, for example, with the theory of St. Cyprian, who held that the episcopate was founded on "one man" (Peter) in order to illustrate its unity and the possession of it in its plenitude by each bishop and by none above the rest. In criticizing the efforts of Bellarmine to escape the inferences of his own argument, Andrewes observes that it is hard to see in what way bishops differ from delegates if the Pope can regularly use such terms as "to give, deprive, revoke, concede," and the like. He makes the very shrewd comment that for advancing the papal claims "it would indeed be a great inconvenience if all bishops equally were successors of the apostles, or all equally had their jurisdiction from the apostles, and did not depend upon the Pope."

The papalism, then, to which Andrewes opposes the Anglican position was the papalism of Trent—a papalism which claimed with a new vigour, not only the supreme government of the Church, but the supreme government of the world. This was left in no doubt by the Pope's attitude to the Oath referred to above; and the heart of the issue was stated by Bellarmine when he said that no Catholic could deny the Temporal Power. When we consider this, we should be surprised at the moderation with which Andrewes defends the Royal Supremacy. Since the King, he says, possesses no spiritual functions analogous to those claimed by the Pope, his power to order the affairs of the Church is certainly not in excess of those traditionally exercised by Christian princes, by whose authority, for example, all general councils and many local synods have been called, and to whom such titles as that of "veræ religionis rector" (given to Charlemagne by the Council of Mainz) have been applied.

Behind the argument he perceives two fundamental questions:

1. What is the relation of a Christian government to the Church? The papal theory not only deprives it of any province, in ordering the affairs of the Church, independent of the Pope

and thereby relieves it of a responsibility which God conspicuously laid on the kings of Israel and which, as a matter of history, Christian kings have discharged; but beyond this, the papal theory reduces temporal monarchs to the same feudal vassalage as the bishops.

2. Do all human institutions, political and social, derive their authority from the Pope? Certainly, the apostles held no such theory, since they counselled obedience even to heathen rulers "as the ordinance of God." "Where the Church has not bound," says Andrewes, "it cannot loose." To make all human relations dependent upon the Pope is to dissolve the basis of society.

The attitude of Andrewes is in effect that there are large areas of human life that are not properly controlled by religion in its ecclesiastical organization. Indeed, the Roman position in his day was not simply that the State must be subject to the Church, but rather that State and Church are equally dependent on the Pope, whose jurisdiction in both spheres is derived directly from God. To hold, as Andrewes did, that kings rule in their own province by Divine right was simply a counterpoise to this, and implied ultimately that government must have a status independent of the Church. He did not provide a solution of the problem of Church and State, but he suggested (and the history of his time confirms the truth of the suggestion) that an ecclesiastical organization that regards every human creature as subject, in every aspect of life, to a single earthly ruler, is the one solution that will not work. However we may blame Andrewes for his devotion to a sovereign who made the bishops' cause his own, his formulation of Anglican principles so successfully avoided an incorporation of the Royal Supremacy in the essential constitution of the Church that, to say nothing of the subsequent attenuation of that Supremacy in England itself, the Anglican Communion has shown its capacity to take root and grow, in other countries, upon a purely episcopal foundation and without any sort of connection with the State.

III

The third, and in many respects the most important, element in the teaching of Bishop Andrewes, and that in which he most conspicuously represents the intention of the English Reformation, is his definition of the appeal to antiquity. In a famous passage he declares:

> "One canon reduced to writing, three creeds, four general councils, five centuries and the series of Fathers in that period . . . determine the boundary of our faith."

By such a thesis he certainly did not imply that all subsequent developments are to be condemned, for elsewhere he speaks reverently of later councils, general and provincial. Nor, on the other hand, did he contemplate the utterly futile experiment of a return to the precise conditions of the primitive Church, since he reminds Cardinal du Perron that the Churches of England and Rome are equally incapable of reproducing the circumstances of the Church in St. Augustine's day.

What he did desire to provide was a standard, within the history of the Church itself, by which the development of doctrines and institutions might be tested. Realizing keenly the enormous variation to which the Christian tradition had been subject, as well as the unequal value of its elements, he perceived that if the word "Catholic" is to have any proper meaning it must concern some central matrix of faith and order that may be justly called *de fide* clearly discernible in the first centuries of the Church's life. To his mind, one of the chief problems of authority is to preserve the proportion of the faith, to discriminate between what is essential and what is variable. Thus, referring to the fact that in the Scriptures "some things the apostles commanded, some things they only gave counsel for," he warns us "neither to dispense with the commandments nor to make a matter of necessity of the counsel, both which have not a little harmed the Church."

Behind the appeal to antiquity there lies, obviously, the assumption that there is a norm for the Church, and that the New Testament and the first five centuries of Christian history exhibit it with sufficient clearness; that the structure of the Church and the content of its faith cannot be substantially altered without depriving the idea of catholicity of any rational meaning.

Under the stimulus of the evolutionary idea we find it very difficult to think so. But there is a necessary qualification to the theory of development—namely, that every development does tend to the production of a classic type. Not only is there everywhere a tendency to decadence; but there is the further fact of observation that degeneration almost always sets in *after the classic type has been produced*, and then by the exaggeration of some tendency, inherent perhaps, but previously held in check or diverted to some other end. In biological evolution this may be seen with sufficient abstraction in the pathetic history of the trilobite, who, after a noble triumph of self-fulfilment, destroyed himself in the pursuit of personal adornment. The lesson of nature seems to be very clearly that the goal of evolution, for each form or type of life, is the production of the norm, and that having produced it, evolution

goes on to play variations on it which frequently end in its destruction.

In applying this conception of the classic type to the development of Christianity there are, no doubt, some difficulties; but there are at least three considerations which may be urged to justify it:

1. It gives us a point of view in common with the Church of the Fathers. The vital significance of the conflict with Gnosticism and Montanism lay in its disclosing a prospect of vast development and a need for some principle of control. Now the principle of control, embodied in Canon, Creed, Liturgy, and Episcopate, which the instinct of the Church brought forth, was an authority historical rather than oracular. The emphasis on the Scriptural source of doctrine and the public and continuous witness of the Church involved precisely the kind of standard proposed by Andrewes. To allow five centuries as the "boundary" is not to set an arbitrary limit for the emergence of novelties which may be called catholic, but, on the contrary, to allow a period large enough for the relation between constant and variable elements to make itself manifest.

2. It provides for Christianity the broadest basis compatible with the preservation of its character as an historic religion. After all, the trouble with most developments has been the tendency to destroy the proportion of the faith and to arrogate to themselves a finality far less tolerable and reasonable than that postulated of the faith and order of the early Church. This is indeed in large measure the cause of the present confusion of the Churches: one section of Christendom has canonized a certain development, and another, in reacting from it, has stereotyped its reaction, until everywhere, by the refusal to acknowledge an objective, historical standard of criticism, development has run riot. It is no belittling of the rôle of charity in the reunion of the Churches to say that there must be some intellectual basis of reunion. Such a basis can be no other than the admission that there is, beyond all past and future developments of Christianity, a norm which embodies all that was "of faith" in the early centuries and nothing that was not. May it not be that in the first few centuries of the Church's life, as in the first few bars of a symphony, God struck out the theme upon which succeeding ages have played such amazing variations and which He intends to bring forth again, in its original simplicity, but with a new richness drawn from the involutions through which it has passed?

3. The problem of missions, it is becoming increasingly clear, is to convey to peoples with other backgrounds than our own, an essential outline of Christianity which they may be

free to paint in with colours expressing their own racial character and spirit. Up to a certain point the impression of one culture on another does good; but beyond that point it does much evil by too closely identifying the scope of development with a particular temper. The Reformation raised the issue as to whether the Latin expression of Christianity is the only authentic and universally sovereign expression. In precisely the same way the missionary extension in the East has raised the question whether the Christianity of Europe and America is determinative of all future development. It will therefore be the wisdom of the Christian missionary to take care that what he plants in the Orient is catholic in the properly restrictive and critical sense that belongs to the word, "neither to dispense with the commandments nor to make a matter of necessity of the counsel, both which have not a little harmed the Church."

In the man whose views we have tried to understand somewhat because of their enormous influence in shaping the principles of the Anglican Church, we see exemplified Joubert's ideal of "vital impulse governed by vital restraint." His passionate loyalty to his Church did not blind him to its weaknesses, for he prayed for "the supplying of what is wanting, the strengthening of what remains"; his reverence for Christian institutions did not degenerate into mere ecclesiasticism; the devoutness of his heart was equalled by the penetration and critical acumen of his mind. His was a temper for a helmsman in troubled seas, a temper the times bid us admire and imitate. As we look back upon the tangled past we are like to console ourselves with the reflection that things have always come right, and will again if only we let them alone; but this is to forget that, under God, they have come right through the labour and resolution of men, generally in a minority, who, as they look with anxiety yet without dismay upon the evils of the age, have sought, above the clamour of contemporary watchwords, the tested strength of true and reasonable principles.

William H. Nes.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

Among contributors to the present issue, Mr. Laurence Housman is well known as the author of *St. Francis Poverello*, *Little Plays of St. Francis*, and many other works. The Rev. W. H. Nes is an American priest of the diocese of Washington, who has been spending a year in special study at Oxford. Canon Marsh, who writes of the miners, is Vicar of Mansfield, the headquarters of the Nottinghamshire coal-field.

The Lower Houses of Convocation were somewhat taken aback in July by finding presented to them, if not pressed upon them, the draft of a revised Catechism which had been prepared by a Committee of the House of Bishops. The draft is to be the subject of careful scrutiny by a committee of the Canterbury Lower House, and will be considered by the House itself at a special session on October 14; and we do not propose to make any comment upon it in detail. But what we do venture to urge with all possible insistence is that the policy of revising the Catechism at all should be approached with the utmost caution. Whatever objections lay against alternative Eucharistic canons lie even more strongly against alternative Catechisms. For the Catechism is something intended to be learnt and known by heart, and is the medium through which the rudiments of Christian teaching—and particularly its moral teaching—reach thousands who are not regular Church-goers at all. It concerns also the teachers in our schools no less than the clergy. The whole essence of such a standard of teaching is that it should be one, and not two. This would not, of course, prohibit the addition of a section on the Church; nor would it prevent amendment in those one or two phrases—such as "children of wrath"—which are in effect mistranslations. But, for the rest, we do not hesitate to say that the true principle of progress is embodied, as so often, in the old maxim, "Leave well alone."

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

It has been pointed out to me that, in my short notice of Dr. Rigg's excellent *Commentary on Samuel*, I seriously misrepresent him by the assertion that he gives no hint that Samuel's command to exterminate the Amalekites was not the command of God. I have read again the relevant pages in Dr. Rigg's book, and I confess, with shame, that I have erred in this matter. Dr. Rigg goes out of his way to do what I have said he had not done. He says that Christ could not have given such an order; that man's understanding of God's character is progressive. I apologize, unreservedly, to Dr. Rigg and to his publishers for this mistake.

A. E. Baker.

August 7, 1926.

NOTES

FROM A MINING CENTRE

THE claim of this short article to a place in THEOLOGY must be found in the definition of Theology as a "Science," and Science is a systematized statement of facts. The facts here recorded do not comprise the whole of the Church's position in a mining area, since the ordinary work of the Church is on lines which may be observed in any parish, and can therefore be excluded for the purpose of this statement of facts as we see them in the heart of one of the richer coalfields of Great Britain.

First of all we are face to face with an unusual attitude of mind: where there is no historic sense there is little surprise that the word Church implies the whole of organized Christianity in the mind of the ordinary miner. The grievances of 100 years ago form the only centre on which the minds of miners are able to concentrate, and that period is ever green in its recurrence in speeches, public or private. Say to a miner, "Why don't you think for yourself?" and he replies, "What's the good, when I pay that bounder over at —— to think for me?" This may seem inconceivable to the educated man, but it indicates the mentality with which the Church has to deal.

This attitude will account for the simplicity with which the miner is led by any strong man, or by his Union, into blind acceptance of any fate they may design for him. The general opinion of the Church held by the miner is based on wrong premises. He considers the Church, as a whole, too conservative to be of any use to the "worker." When weighed in the balance we find that this view is based on experience of some individual who may belong to some Christian community, and who has displayed some weakness not peculiar to any condition of society. The miner will not allow any weakness amongst professed Christians whom he confuses with those who go to some place of worship. We see the fallacy, but the miner does not, or will not. He imagines that employers and others go to church for purposes sinister and ostentatious, forgetting that here we profess ourselves miserable sinners, and are at least "tryers" from that very fact. To the miner the Church is the Church of the Rich, the irony of which is hidden from him, unless he happens to be a churchwarden or sidesman. They often refer to themselves as a class in terms which condemn themselves as an "ignorant lot," and though one may apply the term to their knowledge of Church affairs, it is sweeping and untrue with regard to a large class amongst them which is persevering in the study of Industrial History, Sociology, and Philosophy—especially the Philosophy of Herbert Spencer and Trotsky. This attitude of miners towards the Church has required from some of us a literal acceptance of St. Paul's method of becoming one of them, so that by any means we may save some. The writer was therefore gratified when he arrived at this sphere of work to receive a cordial invitation to speak on the platform of the May Day Labour Demonstrations. Much experience amongst railwaymen in Derby had made this request familiar.

On these occasions we meet at an open space with our band playing, and taking our place next to a Labour M.P., many Trades Union officials, and frequently a Labour Mayor, we proceed amidst raucous sounds and vast crowds to a great field, wherein are ranged four to six wagons

which serve as platforms, marked by figures. The writer is told to mount with the M.P., a miners' Leader, a President of the N.U.R., a Secretary of the Agricultural Labour Union, and others of that type. His address is usually on some Parable with an industrial turn, and his moral is, "Keep the world sane." It is not considered by some to contain sufficient "ginger," but on the whole the Gospel draws bigger crowds than any of the "Red" wagons. On the last occasion the writer refused to mount the wagon until all reference to the glories of Russia had been removed. On one occasion two daring Free Church Ministers joined the Vicar at the Demonstration. They were greeted by members of their congregations by the phrase: "You are well on the road to Hell." One of them replied that he was going "in very good company," indicating the Vicar and the Mayor. He left soon afterwards. The numbers at these Demonstrations vary from 3,000 to 10,000.

Our attitude is not always appreciated by other classes, though we ourselves know what we are doing.

At a famous mansion a lady said to the writer: "I can't think how you can do it." His reply was short and comprehensive: "Perhaps I do it in order that you may remain at ——incidentally."

We believe that as soon as these multitudes cease to invite the Church to share in their deepest convictions, and to set them in order, things will go very badly in the country.

These visits to the Demonstrations are returned by the crowds who come by special invitation to the Parish Church at special Industrial Services, which many employers attend.

We find the miners more susceptible to Communism than any other class of worker, and we are able on these massed occasions to dispel many clouds of distrust and suspicion.

Miners cannot be definitely included in one class under one or two adjectives.

There is much variety in their characters, as we have said. Some will remain unwashed after work for several hours. Others are spotlessly clean within an hour, and turn out in well-fitting clothes, and possess a general appearance and deportment which would not disgrace a 'Varsity man. Many are musical, and most collieries possess a band or chorus, or at least a first-class male quartett. In some subtle way Voice and Coal go together.

As a matter of course we have founded a Town Choral Society and a District Musical Competition Festival. The miners' children in the schools give performances which astonish many of our most experienced adjudicators. Other occupations may be classed under gardening, whippet racing, pigeon flying (almost peculiar to miners), horse racing through the medium of the "Early Bird," and gambling of all kinds. Gambling is our chief source of poverty. In hundreds of cases wages received on pay day are lost in the train called the "Paddy Mail," on the way from the pit to the home on the same day. Thrifty miners possess beautiful homes, and most of the charming bungalows springing up in our district belong to steady miners who work in the more prosperous mines.

During great Strikes, such as those of 1921 and 1926, we are reduced to a state of chaos, materially and mentally. Inconsistencies become rampant.

In the Strike of 1921 conditions were harder and life more difficult.

The present Strike has presented more the appearance of a general holiday. At the end of fourteen weeks we asked some miners if they would be glad to return to work. "Work!" they said, "don't mention the word, and we shall forget it. We are quite comfortable, thanks!" It is here that we reach the height of our own "inconsistencies." All of us are urging the miner to return to work, and we are at the same time doing all we can to keep him out. The Board of Guardians gives large supplies, the Trades Unions assist, the Press and the Labour Party make heavy collections, and the Church pursues her yearly course of relief multiplied a thousandfold. The Education Authorities and other sources reach every possible remaining case of discomfort and make things easy for all. Rents are not paid, though money would seem to be plentiful for amusements and holiday trips. Many miners have been making good money without working in the pits.

The Theatres and Picture Houses are packed, and on the Friday before Bank Holiday £4,000 was taken at one of our town stations from miners and others who were going off to Cleethorpes, Yarmouth, and other holiday resorts. Many of those who went were in receipt of considerable relief from those who could not afford to do the same.

We hear no more of "one man, one job." Miners are now jobbing gardeners, haymakers, harvesters, window-cleaners, etc. Some day the miners hope for a successful issue out of the present struggle from the fact that no coal shall be produced in the country, bringing about general stagnation of industry. What, then, is his inconsistency? In the Welsh Coalfields 5,000 miners are producing sufficient coal from "outcrops" to enable great steelworks to work full time. In Warwickshire the same occurred. In Notts and Derby immense "outcrop" work has been carried on. Miners working on "outcrops" near Chesterfield are producing hundreds of tons of coal (sixty trucks a day) for the large works in Sheffield. The men not only dig it, but arrange for the transport. They sleep at the "outcrop." Much has been said during the discussions upon the Royal Commission's Report concerning Royalties, with special emphasis on the point that Royalties should be taken away from Royalty owners. Yet in the face of the declared policy of the Miners' Federation that Royalties should be abolished, we find at Kimberley, Notts, the miners are working "outcrops" and joyfully paying 8s. per day Royalty to the owner of the land.

In the above circumstances we are in sympathy with the railwaymen who refused to jeopardy their position by placing an embargo on the removal of coal by the Railway Companies during the Strike. In the great industrial centres the Church is often placed in difficult positions by the feud between these two classes of workers.

The religion of the miner is usually of an old-fashioned, emotional character, which inclines to nonconformity in rural districts. He enjoys a position in some religious community, and many of the local preachers are miners. Those who embrace Communism are definitely anti-Christian in their outlook.

The miner has much sympathy with those in trouble or those unjustly treated. We have had instances of his championship of an ill-paid parson. The Church is most successful under a Vicar filled with love for his fellow-creatures, with a sense of humour, and a strong sense of vocation. Without these qualities, well-developed, any clergyman would be out of place amongst miners.

In our intimate relationships with these men they tell us much of their real and unfettered feelings concerning industrial affairs.

With regard to recent events, we found that very few had read the Commission Report, but held strong views thereon. They deny that they could ever be disloyal to their country, but loyalty to the Miners' Federation comes before loyalty to the Government. They have believed in Mr. Cook because he promised no reduction of wages and no longer hours. They admit that he has been unable to deliver the goods, but they attribute this rather to the rudeness of his manners and the violence of his speech, which they feel are responsible for the alleged dislike of Mr. Baldwin and the owners towards him. They cannot see how longer hours and therefore greater production will help as a solution of the trouble, when it is admitted that the coal raised before the stoppage with seven hours' work could not be sold, even at a loss. In this area we have not met with any suggestion of breaking away from the Union and going back to work. As a whole they believe in Force. They believe that the Prime Minister could, if he wished, compel the owners to pay the wages of April without any subsidy, and that the pits which cannot pay this should be closed. They think that the threat to close the pits altogether is mere "bluff"; they have heard the same before, and the pits have not been closed to any extent. The day-worker in this area obtained 11s. 3d. per shift. He rarely made a full week, and to reduce this, he contends, is bad not only for the miner but for the community. We have not met any man who would not welcome "District Settlements." It would pay them well in this locality. The clergy here feel that if the pits resume on the lines of individual agreements, which means the breaking away of the men from their leaders, there can be no lasting settlement. We are inclined to believe in some amalgamation of pits on the lines of that now obtaining in the railway world.

As we write, the ballot on the Church proposals is taking place. Whatever the result the miners are much impressed by the intervention of the Bishops and others. We are aware of the opposition of the Government and of the owners. The brightest spot in the whole mining dispute has been this effort of the Church to use her influence, and her remarkable success in moving a body such as the Executive of the Miners' Federation and the whole of the Delegates' Conference to accept the Church's formula to the extent of submitting it to a ballot of the miners. This, as nothing else could, has given the impression that the whole Church, and not any particular parish, is able to adapt herself to enter the industrial area for the purpose of bringing about a settlement.

This augurs well for the I.C.F. Crusade we are about to hold in this Deanery, which will close on October 1. For the past fourteen weeks we have been busy, not only with relief but in the occupation of the men's leisure hours. Nearly every evening we have held giant concerts and entertainments, at which any number from 1,000 to 2,500 have been present. Two of us on our staff being musical, the Vicar as pianist, and one of the junior clergy as a first-class violinist, have, so far as other duties permitted, been much in demand on these occasions. Cricket matches, football, cross-country running, and other sports, of which the Vicar is President, have been arranged, and all has been done to keep the men good-humoured and reasonable that seems humanly possible.

The miners appreciate the efforts of the Church and other religious

bodies fully. We do not expect these things to draw men into the Church in any great numbers, but we are content that deep down in their minds the miners realize that the Church is exhibiting something of the spirit of Christ. On that we can work.

At our open-air meetings we are asked questions on the following lines; sometimes they are vulgar and even worse, but the following will give an idea of the mentality with which we are dealing:

"Is not the Church the greatest of 'royalty' owners, and should they not be abolished?" (Sometimes royalties are confused with Royal Family.)

"Is the Church prepared to give them up?"

"Is not the Church in the pay of the Capitalists?"

"Is the Church not out to dope the working classes?"

"Do you preach the Sermon on the Mount, etc., to the rich?"

"Is it not a fact that the Church tunes her pulpits?"

"Cannot the Church take a definite stand and set forth a definite scheme on technical and Christian lines in co-operation with expert and unbiassed advice?"

"Is it not quite plain to see the falsity of Christianity, seeing that there are divisions and class distinctions in the Churches?"

"Did not Christ take the workers' part?"

"What do you call a living wage?"

"Do you call the Church in the light of Christianity honest in not raising her voice as a corporate body against the bad social conditions and the extreme luxury and waste that exist side by side with them?"

From the above catalogue of questions it may be gathered that there exists some suspicion of organized Christianity amongst the unthinking majority of our people. Religion is to them something which restricts freedom. They appear anxious not to fail in living up to the very high standard of Christianity which is within them, and not to become "hypocrites," which is the one unpardonable sin in their eyes. As in other classes of society our people prefer the freedom to sin. There is little sympathy for those who attempt the higher life, and much condemnation at any sign of failure. It is regarded as humbug to talk about sin as a personal matter, since it is attributed entirely to environment. They say that the present industrial system causes all men to sin, consciously or unconsciously; therefore sin is a purely corporate matter, and the Church must treat it as such. If material affairs affect the character, then the Church ought to eradicate the evil.

It will be observed from such a condition of affairs that ordinary parochial services and classes are not sufficient for these things. We are obliged to be constantly in the market-places teaching, hearing, and answering questions, and striving to win the great outside masses to Christ and His Church.

H. L. Marsh
(Vicar of Mansfield, Notts).

STRACK AND BILLERBECK'S RABBINIC COMMENTARY*

Far sooner than might have been expected the third volume of this splendid commentary has now appeared, dealing with the Epistles and Apocalypse; a fourth volume of excursuses is in the press. Naturally the new book is less interesting than its predecessors, which illustrated

* *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash*, Band III. C. H. Beck, München, 1926.

the Gospels. But it is most timely; every page of the larger part of the book reminds us that St. Paul was a thorough Jew, in spite of the Hellenistic colouring which has been so much emphasized of late. A few examples out of many noted will serve to show how rich is the contribution made to N.T. exegesis.

Rom. i. 20: the Gentiles are without excuse. So the Rabbis taught. Not only had they the Noachic precepts, but the Torah was offered them on Mount Sinai.

ii. 13: not the hearers of the Law are justified, but the doers. Not a truism, but a keenly debated point. When St. Paul wrote, the synagogue agreed with him. After Hadrian had forbidden the study of the Law, opinion changed. Study was held to be the more important, for without it practice would soon cease.

ii. 19: a light to those in darkness. The Rabbis compared the Gentiles to bats.

iii 10: Jews and Greeks alike under sin. No, said some Rabbis. Some men, e.g. the Patriarchs, kept the Torah and were free from sin.

iii. 29: is God the God of the Jews only? R. Shim'on b. Jochai (*c.* 150 A.D.) said He was not the God of the peoples of the world, but of Israel only.

iv. 2: The Rabbinic position was that Abraham was justified by works, faith being a good work.

xii. 20: coals of fire. Tanch. B. § 20 (33 b): "With what is it to be compared? With a baker, who stood at his oven. His enemy came—he swept out the glowing coals and put them on his head. His friend came—he took out warm bread and gave it to him. The glowing coals and the bread both came from the same oven. So God rained down fire upon the Sodomites, and manna from heaven upon the Israelites"—a curious contrast to the Biblical use. But see THEOLOGY, x. 160*f.* (March, 1925).

1 Cor. v. 1: that a man should have his father's wife. This is the regular Rabbinic phrase for step-mother. Such questions were of great importance in regulating the lives of proselytes. 'Aqiba said that it was not allowed "among the Gentiles," R. Eliezer that it was. But the general principle was that a proselyte coming into the Jewish community was newborn; his former relationships did not count. This must have affected the early Christian attitude towards marriage ties "not in the Lord."

vi. 5: recommendation of an arbitrator, to avoid going to law before unbelievers. Three judges were the Rabbinic rule, but a scholar trusted by both sides could act alone in money cases.

xi. 4, 5: the covering of the head in worship. In the first century A.D. Jews were not bound to cover their head, by the fourth century the custom had become general. It was probably beginning in the first century among the strict. Women, at least those who were strict, were covered even in their own homes.

xi. 10: authority on the head because of the angels. The authority is that of the husband; unmarried maidens were not covered. "Because of the angels, that they may exercise their office with joy and not be obliged to become accusing angels instead of guardian angels."

xiv. 27: "If any man speaketh in a tongue, let it be by two, or at the most three, and that in turn; and let one interpret." The Torah-lection was read on the sabbath by seven persons, on weekdays by three—after one another. The prophetic lection and the interpretation demanded one person.

Gal. iii. 28: all one in Christ Jesus, slave and free, male and female. Such unity in the Torah would have been inconceivable to the Jews. Women and slaves were exempt from laws whose observance was bound up with particular times.

iv. 4: "born of a woman." In the Rabbinic sources this either means simply "man," or has the *nuance* of "sinful man."

Eph. iii. 10: God's wisdom known to the heavenly powers through the Church. Cf. the common Rabbinic saying that the righteous are nearer to God than the angels, who will come to the angels and ask, What hath God done?

1 Tim. iii. 2: the bishop a husband of one wife. This introduces an absolutely new principle. It must not be interpreted in the light of v. 9, the widow as wife of one husband, for the Jewish law allowed polygamy, but not polyandry.

W. K. L. C.

THE NEW LIDDELL AND SCOTT

THE first fasciculus of this Dictionary was noticed in the May 1926 number. The second (*ἀποβάλλω—διαλέγω*) is now before us. The following notes draw attention to New Testament words which receive an interpretation differing from that given in the former edition or in the Lexica of the Greek Testament, or are in other respects worthy of notice. LS1=the current (seventh) edition, LS2 the new one, AS=Abbott Smith's *Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament*, MM=Milligan-Moulton's *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*.

ἀποκαταλλάσσω (Eph. ii. 16, Col. i. 20, 21) according to AS and the Commentaries="reconcile completely"; LS 1 and 2, "reconcile again."

ἀποκατάστασις (Acts iii. 21). MM and AS derive the sense from the papyri sense of restoration of temples; LS2 with various astronomical exx. of a return to former position suggests that "the restoration of all things" is the return to primitive perfection.

ἀπόχρησις (Col. ii. 22). LS2 "consumption, using up," a sense not given by LS1; MM, AS "abuse," "misuse."

ἀρεταί (1 Pet. ii. 9). AS "excellencies"; LS2 "glorious deeds," "wonders" (of divine beings), so Deissmann; a sense not given in LS1.

ἄριστον (Mt. xxii. 4, Lk. xiv. 12). Neither LS2 nor MM gives any support to AS, who says that *ἄρ.* in these passages=*δεῖπνον*.

ἀσώτως (Lk. xv. 13). AS "wastefully," not necessarily dissolutely. But all exx. in LS2 support E.V. "in riotous living."

βασιλικός in Jn. iv. 47 may be not a "courtier" (AS), but a subordinate official. In an Egyptian nome the *βασιλικός* (*γραμματεύς*) acted as deputy for the Strategus, LS2, MM. *βαστάζω* has the meaning in pap. of "take away." Jn. xx. 15 shows how this meaning develops from that of "bear." See LS2 and MM. Basil *Reg. Brev. Tract.* 178 in a passage which does not seem to have been used by lexicographers says that this was a local Cappadocian usage. So perhaps St. Paul in Gal. vi. 2 is using the Anatolian idiom familiar to his readers: "*Remove* one another's burdens (of sin and trouble)," which is appropriate to the context. In vi. 5 each shall bear (*βαστάσει*) his own burden of *responsibility for work.*

W. K. L. C.

REVIEWS

MYSTICAL PHENOMENA COMPARED WITH THEIR HUMAN AND DIABOLICAL COUNTERFEITS. A Treatise on Mystical Theology. By Mgr. Albert Farges. Translated from the second French edition by S. P. Jacques. Burns, Oates and Washbourne. 17s. 6d.

This weighty volume, which is a translation of a work by a learned French priest, suggests comparison with the well-known *Graces of Interior Prayer* by Father Poulain. Like Poulain, Mgr. Farges writes from the point of view of Roman Catholic orthodoxy, and as a fervent disciple of St. Teresa and of St. Thomas Aquinas.

He refuses, naturally enough, to have any dealings with the comparative method of study. Phenomena in other religions resembling those of Roman Catholic mysticism are compared with exotic flowers, at times brightly coloured but too often poisonous. From such a point of view, of course, the comparative study of mystical phenomena is impossible. The attempt to use psychology as an instrument for investigating religious phenomena is merely to Mgr. Farges an example of the error and confusion of science falsely so called.

It is, however, idle to complain of a devout and learned work intended primarily for the use of spiritual directors because it is not a contribution to the scientific study of religion. Whatever method of studying mystical phenomena our own prejudices make us prefer, we must recognize that within his voluntarily accepted limitations Mgr. Farges has written a learned, interesting, and profoundly religious work. In his admirable account of the mystical states of consciousness in the first section, one feels that the author has done better than Father Poulain did before. He is more sure than was Poulain that the study of mystical phenomena is an empirical study, and less inclined to indulge in those *a priori* speculations which the modern reader finds an irritating feature of Poulain's book. It is difficult not to feel that those who require orthodox guidance in the direction of mystical souls will be inclined to replace Father Poulain's work by the present one.

Farges, like Poulain, is an uncompromising Teresan. Much of his book is occupied with criticism of the view (which has recently been put forward by Benedictine writers with great persuasiveness) that contemplation is possible to all, and that there is no sharp line of division between the highest stages of ordinary prayer and the lowest stages of mystical prayer. It is mainly to this

controversy and to other related questions that he devotes his second section, in which he makes great use of the weighty authority of Pope Benedict XIV. In all of this controversy Mgr. Farges shows great courtesy to his opponents, but seems to make out a strong case for the view that the opinion which he upholds is the one which has authoritative sanction.

The author's courtesy in controversy even extends to secular psychology. He gives an interesting account of hallucinations, of the phenomena of clairvoyance and of telepathy. This part of the work, however, is marred by a very large number of scientific inaccuracies. He develops, for example, a series of psychological or physiological tests in order to distinguish between perceptions and hallucinations, which are based on a confusion between hallucinations and after-sensations. It is not true, for example, that hallucinations are always projected on to a screen, and that they appear larger when projected on a distant screen, although this is true of visual after-sensations. Hallucinations also do not ordinarily fail to disappear when the eyes are closed, nor do they follow the movements of the eyes. The report quoted by Farges of small images having been seen by an observer in the eyes of persons experiencing hallucinations is so improbable that it is rash to draw conclusions from it unless much more cogent evidence is brought forward. His observations on the nature of light partake of the same uncertainty. He apparently supposes that no electro-magnetic waves outside the range of the visible spectrum suffer refraction, although, in fact, this is only true of very short waves and not of long ones. The author seems to fail to realize that the fact that X rays are not refracted would make it impossible for an image to be formed on the retina by these rays, so his explanation of the phenomena of clairvoyance by assuming an abnormal sensitivity of the medium's retina to X rays is a thoroughly unsound one of a kind which one might not be surprised to hear discussed in a schoolboy's debating society, but which is altogether out of place in a learned work.

Mgr. Farges's excursions into psycho-pathology have the same unscientific character. It is altogether beside the point to demonstrate that the mental and physical conditions of St. Teresa are not identical with the typical symptoms of " madness," of a catalepsy, or of hysteria as described in a medical text-book. Very few individuals who are undoubtedly psycho-neurotic do show the symptoms of the " typical case." Hence the difficulty of classification of mental disorders. Moreover, had Mgr. Farges discussed St. Catherine of Genoa instead of St. Teresa, he would have found that many of the symptoms described in her life might have been text-book illustrations of

typical symptoms of hysteria. In any case, the medical unbeliever might maintain perfectly reasonably against all argument of this kind that religious ecstasy was a psycho-neurotic disorder of a distinct kind. A valid argument for the reality of the experience of contact with God in religious ecstasy must be an argument of the moral or spiritual order, and these were the arguments which, on the whole, St. Teresa herself used.

The important part of Mgr. Farges's work is, however, the part in which his misunderstandings of science and of scientific psychology are unimportant. This is his description of mystical phenomena as they have appeared in the Roman Catholic Church. It may be doubted whether this description has ever been better done, and all of the book is illuminated by a deep religious feeling which makes it a delight to read.

R. H. Thouless.

The Samaritans: Their History, Doctrines, and Literature. With six Appendices and nineteen Illustrations. By Moses Gaster, Ph.D. (The Schweich Lectures, 1923). Oxford University Press. 10s. 6d.

Let no one expect in this highly interesting and thought-provoking volume a systematic treatise on the history of the Samaritans and their literature. It is essentially a warm plea for the autochthonous nature of the Samaritans, for the reliability of their traditions, and for the great antiquity of their Pentateuch. All other theories concerning problems such as, for example, the origin of the Septuagint and its relation to the Massoretic and Samaritan Texts, are based on these premises, and stand or fall with them.

Lecture I. deals with the history of the Samaritans. According to their tradition, the establishment of the Tabernacle, or Sanctuary, took place in the time of Joshua. It was set up on Mount Gerizim, and not on Mount Ebal, as the Massoretic Text has it; Eleazar, the son of Aaron, being the High Priest. After a time a schism arose within the priestly families; rivalry was latent between the descendants of Eleazar and Ithamar. The feud between the two lines broke out fiercely when Eli separated himself from the priests of the Sanctuary on Gerizim, and established a rival Sanctuary at Shiloh. This schismatic movement culminated in the building of the Temple in Jerusalem, and it came to a final break in the time of Ezra. Eli represented the Ithamar branch. He was joined in his schismatic work by Samuel, a descendant of Korah (1 Chron. vi. 18-24, A.V. 33-8), the revolt of his ancestor against Moses and Aaron being the background for this new rebellion. At that time the Ark with the

Holy of Holies suddenly disappeared. It had been taken by the then High Priest Uzzi and placed in a cave in Mount Gerizim, after which the cave suddenly closed.

It is remarkable that Gaster, although he mentions the parallel Jewish legend concerning the disappearance of the Ark, preserved in 2 Macc. ii. 4, yet does not draw the obvious conclusion that the Samaritan version is merely an echo of the Jewish one.

Again, according to Samaritan tradition, Eli, in order to give some authority to his Sanctuary, had taken with him one of the copies of the Law made by Moses, which had belonged to Ithamar. This the Samaritans claim to be identical with the copy now in their possession. All this, one would think, should be treated as a late Samaritan polemical Midrash, and not as anything possessing historical value. But not so Gaster, for he treats it seriously, solving many burning Biblical problems in its light.

To the Samaritans, David's motive in selecting Jerusalem as the religious as well as the political centre meant a transference, as it were, " of the holiness of Mount Gerizim to the Sanctuary on Mount Moriah." They saw in this a definite break and a defiance of all God's ordinances, and called the Temple at Jerusalem instead of Bet Mikdash, Bet Maktash, " the House of Shame." Yet, this hardly proves the antiquity of the idea. In dealing with the Samaritan Pentateuch, Gaster naïvely lays emphasis on the Samaritan rejection of the Prophets: " If they accepted the Pentateuch at the late date at which they are assumed to have done, there is no reason why they should have refused to incorporate into their literary property such other books found in the Bible to which no dogmatic objection could be raised. *The inevitable conclusion is that at the time when they accepted the Pentateuch the Prophetic and Hagiographic literature was not yet in existence*, and that when they became conscious of the difference which separated the North from the South, with the building of the Temple in Jerusalem as a rival to that on Mount Gerizim, they objected to everything found in the rival kingdom and produced by men of the rival faith. According to the Samaritans, then, their history practically begins with the settlement of the Tribes in the Holy Land. They claim to be the descendants of Ephraim and Manasseh as far as the lay population is concerned, together with a number of adherents from among the other tribes, whilst the priests claim to be the true descendants in an unbroken line from Pinehas, the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron." But could not the reason for the Samaritans' non-acceptance of the prophetic writings be simply that Zion plays the central rôle there ? And once they have

built a Sanctuary on Gerizim—say about 400 B.C.—they could hardly accept the "Prophets," to whom the "Mountain of the Lord" is Zion, and not Gerizim. And yet Gaster goes on to reconstruct Biblical history from these slight, and evidently late, Samaritan traditions; for are not they all written in the "Chain of the High Priests," the Tolida, the Arabic paraphrase of the Book of Joshua—above all, in the Arabic chronicle of Abul Tath (compiled in the fourteenth century A.D.)? Gaster may be justified in thinking that these late compilations contain ancient material, but surely they are scarcely ancient enough for him thus to pin his faith to them.

In Lecture II., "Doctrines and Religious Practices," Gaster is on firmer ground, and as a summary of Samaritan religious ideas and ideals it is both interesting and instructive, and should prove a valuable mine to students of this subject. The same can be said of Lecture III., "Literature." Space precludes the discussion of the very important problems raised by them, for in this volume Gaster has certainly raised many, and the book will undoubtedly cause scholars "furiously to think."

It would have added to the convenience and value of the book if a bibliography had been attached to it, where Juynholl's *Commentarii in historiam gentis Samaritanæ*, Friedrich's *De christologia Samaritarum*, Gesenius's *De Samaritanorum theologia*, and Brüll's important work, *Zur Geschichte und Literatur der Samaritaner*, would doubtless be found. The author refers once or twice to Gesenius, but does not mention his epoch-making treatise, *De Pentateuchi Samaritani origine indole et auctoritate* (Halle, 1815). And, stranger still, he seldom deals with the early Rabbinic references to the Samaritans, although they are of great archæological importance.

PAUL P. LEVERTOFF.

NOTICES

A STUDY IN MORAL THEORY. By John Laird, M.A. Allen and Unwin. 10s. 6d.

This is an important book. Its author, the Regius Professor of Moral Philosophy at Aberdeen, is known as a sound thinker, neither revolutionary nor conservative, whose clear and attractive way of writing is a welcome contrast to that of the writers on ethics and metaphysics who are content to express themselves in the barbarous language into which German philosophy books are translated. It is no exaggeration to say that this study is in the great tradition of English ethical theory, not unworthy to be put beside the work of Sidgwick and John Stuart Mill and the others of that great line which includes Bishop Butler and the Cambridge Platonists. It is, nevertheless, in the best sense a *livre de circon-*

stance, and any educated reader could discover from this book what are the critical points in the discussion of moral theory at the present time.

The book is divided into four parts. It begins with an analysis of the relation of the idea of value to that of morality, arriving at the conclusion that values and practical excellences are often non-moral, and only become part of the moralist's concern when the question arises whether they ought to be renounced or sought after. Then comes a fresh and stimulating psychological enquiry, for it goes without saying that a study of conduct must involve psychological considerations at every turn, and much ethical discussion in the past has been sterile because it was not preceded by a psychological analysis of such concepts as "will" and knowledge of right and wrong. In days when psycho-analysis seems, to many, to have discredited the authority of conscience and reason, it is interesting to find so dependable a writer saying that these "higher controls" have not only an authority, but also a power, that nothing else can have. The third part of the book deals with some social implications of the author's theory of morality, and the last chapter outlines some of the metaphysical issues.

Professor Laird emphasizes the separation between "ought" and "is," setting up a dualism which surely cannot be ultimate. He holds that the general principle of morals is that "duty is the best use that any moral being or set of moral beings can make of their capacities with regard to a given opportunity. He rejects determinism; he is not satisfied that conscience and duty can be explained as merely the product of social custom, and in general he is opposed to a naturalistic system of ethics. We commend the book to all students of the subject. A. E. Baker.

Religious Experience: Its Nature and Truth. By Kenneth Edward, D.Phil. The Kerr Lectures. T. and T. Clark. 8s.

The Kerr Lectureship in the United Free College in Glasgow has produced many interesting and valuable books, which have won for themselves a recognized place in modern theology. The late Professor Orr's *Christian View of God and the World*, Dr. Forrest's *The Christ of History and of Experience*, to name but two, belong to this series, and also, greatest of all, *The Problem of Faith and Freedom*, by Principal John Owen. Mr. Edward's book deserves the high praise that it is *worthy* of its place among the other Kerr Lectures. It is very learned, it is thoughtful and acute, and its reasoning is clear. If it is not very easy to read, well, they take their theology a little more strenuously north of the Tweed than we do in England.

Mr. Edward's book falls naturally into two parts, which for convenience may be called the psychology and the philosophy of religion. In the first part of the book there are two things which stand out prominently. The first is that psychologists are busy digesting the work of Professor William Otto, of Marburg. What, after all, is the truth about religious faith, in its simplest and most primitive form? Is the Divine an immediate datum of experience, as Otto suggests, or is it a deduction, more or less direct, from man's experience of nature, or from his dreams, or from his thoughts about the dead? There is no doubt that Otto's *Idea of the Holy* has made all previous psychology of religion out of date; whether or not his views are finally accepted, he has necessitated a complete reconsideration of the whole subject.

The other point of importance in Mr. Edward's account of religious experience is the emphasis that he puts on what Shand and McDougall have named *sentiments*. It is when we realize that religion is a sentiment, in their sense of the word, that it is part of the structure of the mind, an organized system of emotions and ideas and impulses, that we see the meaning of many facts of religious experience which, otherwise, could hardly be related to our general study of the subject. There is room, as Mr. Edward says, for a fuller study of the religious ideas which are the background of that theory; it is "Moral Philosophy" in a very full sense of the phrase.

The last eighty pages or so deal with what is the most acute problem that present-day apologetic has to face, the attack on the validity and truth of religion from the standpoint of psychology. Is religious experience a delusion? As it has been interpreted in terms of general psychology, can we, or, indeed, must we, go on to recognize that there is no need to assume that there is any actual fellowship with God at the basis of religion? Since suggestion and sympathy and emotion, by common consent, play a large part in religion, is it not thereby discredited? Every teacher of religion knows how much these questions are "in the air" at the moment. We have nowhere seen them dealt with more fairly, more adequately, or more convincingly than in this book. A. E. Baker.

The Liturgical Psalter. By W. H. Frere, C.R., Bishop of Truro. Mowbrays. 6s.

In the very learned, helpful, and exhaustive preface to this Psalter, the Bishop of Truro points out that, although the Prayer-book arranges for the recitation of the whole Book of Psalms each month, only a very few lay-people actually attempt the task, most people only taking part in the monthly course on four days of the month, their selection depending on the kalendar. The scheme of revision, he continues, which forms part of the alternative Prayer-book, would make it permissible, on Sundays at any rate, to give up the principle of recitation-in-course for that of selection.

The Liturgical Psalter consists of a series of Psalms selected for liturgical purposes, selected on their merits—that is, their utility for use by ordinary congregations. A few psalms, eleven in all, are entirely omitted, and in certain cases only portions of psalms are used.

Dr. Frere does not always give the exact Prayer-book text. He says that there are many places where changes, which in regard to rhythm are almost unnoticeable, afford enormous help in clearing the sense, such as changes of tense, particle, and person, and in many cases he has inserted some such word as "saying" before passages in *oratio recta*. He has also made a most interesting attempt to make certain rhythmical alterations in the text, bearing in mind the needs and limitations of the Anglican chant.

An immense amount of thought has been given of recent years to the pointing of the Psalms, and several newly pointed Psalters have recently appeared, the *raison d'être* of all of them being the more harmonious welding together of words and music.

All who are interested in this subject know only too well the difficulty of the very short verse or half-verse. It is, for instance, impossible to sing such a half-verse as "and our tongue with joy" (Ps. cxxvi. 2) to the

second phrase of an Anglican chant with any satisfactory effect. In plainsong the redundant notes can be omitted, not so with Anglicans. Dr. Frere boldly attacks this problem by lengthening the sentence. In the above-quoted instance he reads, "And our tongue with a song of joy." Similarly (cxxviii. 4), for "round about thy table" he reads "gathered round about thy table."

Despite the many advantages that can be urged on behalf of plainsong, there is no doubt that the Anglican chant has come to stay, and it seems to us that in any revision of the Psalms this must be borne in mind. There can be very little doubt that all the Editors of the recently published pointed Psalters would have had far easier tasks if the text upon which they worked was Dr. Frere's, and not that of the Prayer-book.

These points, together with many others, are very fully discussed by Dr. Frere in his preface, and one can cordially welcome *The Liturgical Psalter* as a very real contribution to the problem of the revision of the Psalms.

It only remains to add that the volume is well printed, and appears to be commendably free from misprints. C. Hylton Stewart.

The Date of the Exodus. By J. W. Jack, M.A. T. and T. Clark. 10s.

Students of the Old Testament, whether they agree with Mr. Jack's conclusions or not, owe him a debt of gratitude for having collected together the very numerous and very varied data underlying the fascinating but obscure problem which forms the subject of his volume.

Three main theories of the date of the Exodus hold the field. The traditional school sees in Rameses II. the Pharaoh of the oppression, and places the Exodus under his son Merenptah (*c.* 1233–1223 B.C.). Another rather small school would date it about a century earlier, and connects it with the failure of the religious reforms of Akhenaten. Mr. Jack himself dates the Exodus earlier still, about 1445 B.C. He regards Thutmose III. as the oppressor, and with good reasons to support him, and his son Amenhotep II. as the Pharaoh of the Exodus. The Hebrew entry into Canaan will thus agree with the movements of the Habiru described in the Tell el-Amarna Tablets. The latter part of the theory fits in with that of H. R. Hall, though he connects the actual expulsion from Egypt with the downfall of the Hyksos (*c.* 1580 B.C.).

Mr. Jack is at his best when arguing in support of his own theory, his efforts to disprove other theories being not quite so convincing. He dismisses much too readily (in a footnote on p. 19) the possibility of there having been more than one Exodus. It seems to the present writer that in not a few cases difficulties in the Old Testament have arisen through the combination of traditions coming from different groups within the nation of Israel—a good example is Sinai, the site of which cannot be located in such a manner as to satisfy all the biblical data.

One proposed identification which I do not remember coming across before is very attractive. Mr. Jack sees in "Pharaoh's daughter" (Exod. ii. 5 *ff.*) the famous Queen Hatshepsut, a princess of noble character and largeness of heart.

The volume is one to be commended to all who are interested in the Old Testament; it states clearly and fairly the various views as to the date of the Exodus, and makes out a very strong, if not entirely convincing, case for the early date. L. Elliott Binns.

MIDRASH SIFRE ON NUMBERS. Translated by Paul P. Levertoff, with an Introduction by G. H. Box. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

For a number of years now the S.P.C.K. has been doing very valuable work in its series *Translations of Early Documents*. The works which have hitherto appeared under that general heading have all been Jewish, and all belong to the period which follows our Old Testament. We have at last realized the fundamental importance of these texts for the understanding of the literary environment of the New Testament, and for the whole world of thought which lay behind its writers. Rabbinic literature helps us to see a side of Pharisaism which, perhaps, we should not have suspected from our Gospels or from the writings of that advanced Pharisee, St. Paul. We can see and estimate the great strength of the real leaders of Judaism, their high standards of scholarship, their intense devotion to their religion, their passionate conviction that the Bible is the final revelation of God to man.

The Midrashim do not belong to the earliest stratum of Rabbinical texts, but they are none the less of very great importance, for they undoubtedly contain material that is traditional, and whilst they have not that air of scientific exegesis that belongs to the Mishnah, they tell us quite as much of the spirit of popular Judaism. Thus we all have reason to be grateful to Mr. Levertoff for these selections from one of the most interesting parts of this body of literature. The choice of passages has been made with discrimination, and they have been well translated. How difficult a task this is can only be appreciated by those who have attempted to understand the Hebrew text for themselves, and though, for instance, we might have preferred a transliteration of the phrase " Beth Din," with an explanatory footnote, to " the Judicial Court," this is largely a matter of taste.

It only remains to notice the Introduction, in which the most distinguished of Christian Rabbinic scholars has given us an admirable account of Midrashic literature in small compass. The book should be read by everyone who wishes seriously to understand the Jewish background against which alone primitive Christianity can rightly be seen.

T. H. ROBINSON.

THE SONG OF MYSTERY: A DEVOTIONAL STUDY OF THE BOOK OF CANTICLES. By S. L. Christian. With a Preface by B. W. Randolph, M.A., Canon of Ely. Longmans, 6s.

VIA MYSTICA: A DEVOTIONAL TREATISE ON THE LIFE OF PRAYER BASED UPON THE SONG OF SONGS. By the Rev. Jesse Brett, L.Th. With a Preface by the Rev. W. J. Sparrow-Simpson, D.D. S.P.C.K. 8s. 6d.

These two volumes ought to have exchanged titles. The first is a simple and straightforward account of the " Via Mystica "—that is to say, of the progress of the soul from the moment of her call up to her final union with God; while the second contains an elaborate allegorical interpretation of the Song of Solomon. The author of *The Song of Mystery* would have been well advised to omit all reference to the poetry she professes to expound, for her story of religious life and religious experience within convent walls is interesting enough to stand by itself, and loses rather than gains from being interwoven with an Eastern love-poem. Indeed, there is striking and, at times, distressing incongruity between the ardent

language of the Song of Songs and the delicate spirituality of this unworldly nun. Father Brett, on the other hand, keeps so close to the text he is interpreting, that it would be impossible to disentangle his thoughts from the verses around which they are twined.

Sister Christian, who writes *The Song of Mystery*, is a Religious of many years' standing. She is speaking first of all to her own sisters in religion, but hopes that the book will reach a wider circle. We have no hesitation in saying that it will. There has been of late years a notable revival of interest in the monastic life. There are far more monks and nuns in England now than there were fifty years ago. Their friends and acquaintances want to know why these men and women are drawn to the cloister, and what they do all day in that strange existence remote from all that makes life worth living. Sister Christian, without in any way setting out to gratify lay curiosity, leaves the convent door ajar. The inquisitive may look in; if they look with sympathetic gaze, they may see a good deal.

Amazing! Have we not thought that the life of a nun, at its worst an intolerable bondage, must be at best merely a placid, uneventful servitude? We never guessed that it could be thrillingly interesting. Sister Christian, however, leaves us in no doubt. From the first calling of the soul to complete self-dedication, up to the Beatific Vision, the progress is real, vital, adventurous, free. The nun is not giving herself over to spiritual idling, not learning to dream away long hours, vaguely bored, in the dim light of a convent chapel. She is disciplining her will, directing her emotions, awakening and using new and mighty powers of consciousness. The experienced sister can afford to smile at the accusation that she is wasting her time, and that she accomplishes nothing, while other good people have to do the work of the world. She is, or should be, a pioneer in the realms of the spirit.

> "The twilight of our mysteries
> Shines like high noonday on her face,
> Our piteous guesses, dim with fears;
> She touches, handles, sees and hears. . . ."

And, if it be true that the Religious attains in this life to states of consciousness that all men will, as disembodied spirits, ultimately enjoy, an account of her spiritual adventures is of practical importance to everyone. Those who feel that this is a matter of present and not merely of future interest should read what Sister Christian has to say.

Father Brett writes, perhaps, from equally deep personal experience and conviction. His book, however, is cast in a form that is out of fashion. Between Higher Criticism, on the one hand, and Freudian symbolism on the other, allegorical interpretation on religious lines of such literature as the Song of Solomon can hardly stand. It seems a pity that the learned and devout author did not turn his energy into other channels. However, put the book away for a while. There are fashions in piety as in everything else. In ten years' time allegorical interpretation may be just what appeals to the taste of the moment.

ÆLFRIDA TILLYARD.

THE PARISH PRIEST. By J. G. H. Barry and S. P. Delany. New York: Gorham.

Those who know anything of the progress of the Catholic Revival in America have long recognized that the solemn and beautiful church of St. Mary the Virgin, New York, stands for all that is best in the revival; and we very heartily welcome the excellent book on *Pastoralia* which comes to us from two priests of this parish.

The book deals first with the priest himself—"the priest in his inner life." If he is to do his work well, his first care must be for his own soul. "It is what we are that preaches." So the priest's day is described, with its centre in the oblation of the holy sacrifice and a careful meditation. The importance of study is rightly emphasized; and the authors insist that no study is so valuable and indispensable as the study of the text of Holy Scripture. Some readers will consider that on some points Dr. Barry is a little old-fashioned. He revives for us the priestly ideals of Cardinal Manning; though the priest is by no means to live secluded in his sacristy, he is to live a lonely and consecrated life; his dress and his habits are to be conspicuously unlike those of a layman.

The book is full of fresh and penetrating remarks. "The Christian life is not a worldly life with a veneer of practices." "If we do not feel obliged to be the best preachers we can be, we ought not to preach at all." "It is surprising how few of our clergy make it their chief end to lead their people into the way of perfection." "As little should be made of ceremonial as possible. It should not be constantly put forward, and emphasized and talked about. Its devotional value should be stressed. If the emphasis all through one's conduct of parish life is placed where it belongs, on devotional and spiritual values, if it is evident that these are what is sought in all the priest does, he may count on the loyalty and support of his congregation as a whole; and when the parish as a whole is loyal, it will be difficult for one or two persons to make trouble."

J. F. BRISCOE.

HOW NATIVES THINK (*Les fonctions mentales dans les sociétés inférieures*). By Professor Lucien Lévy-Bruhl. Translated by Lilian A. Clare. George Allen and Unwin. 1926. 12s. 6d net.

English-reading students of primitive psychology owe a debt of gratitude to Miss Lilian Clare for her excellent translation of Professor Lévy-Bruhl's well-known work, *Les fonctions mentales dans les sociétés inférieures* (third edition, 1918), thereby making this stimulating book accessible to many who, not being professional anthropologists, may not be very familiar with the theory of prelogical mentality as advocated by the French School of sociologists.

According to Professor Lévy-Bruhl, the primitive mind is essentially mystic, and fails to differentiate between the objective qualities of an object and the subjective reactions. Everything is permeated by forces and influences and actions, which, though imperceptible to sense, are nevertheless real, and consequently the world of fact becomes full of mystery (pp. 38, 288). It thinks in terms of collective representations in which objects are not divided from one another, but united in a bond so intimate that they each participate in the other, making it what it is not. This he calls the "law of participation" (p. 76). In this way, it is explained how one and the same entity may be simultaneously present

in many places, as in the case of the separable and multiple soul (pp. 84, 87, 101 *f.*), and one object or person may influence another by mystic symbols (p. 49), and all the various ritual observances commonly known as " sympathetic magic " (p. 298). Thus he concludes that " les sociétés inférieures " are in " la mentalité prélogique " because the identification of objects in one another violates the " law of contradiction," or mechanical causation (*i.e.*, that nothing can be at once A and also B, which is other than A) which he supposes to govern civilized thinking (pp. 78, 376).

On this hypothesis, Totemism, for instance, is explained as a mystic participation of the totemic group in the supernatural essence of the animal or vegetable species the name of which it bears (p. 91 *f.*). The totemite believes that he is both a man and an animal, the symbiosis being strengthened by sacred dances and ceremonies (such as the *Intichiuma* rites held in the spring to make the totems increase) in which he frequently disguises himself as the sacred ally by a mask or other symbol, and represents its gestures. Similarly, the external soul of the individual, which in Australia consists of a piece of wood or stone (called *churinga*) decorated with mystic totemic designs, is thought to be a sort of reservoir of totemic vitality and a vehicle of mystic power, by which participation in the sacred species is preserved (pp. 92, 120, 338).

But if primitive man is not aware of the distinction between himself and the animal creation, he can hardly be illogical if he thinks that he is some other creature. Moreover, it is difficult to see how these collective representations differ fundamentally from the ideas current among civilized peoples, since in all stages of cultures " the law of participation " and " the law of contradiction " appear to enter into human mentality. The primitive conception of an all-pervading essence in the world finds a parallel psychologically in the modern philosophical doctrine of " concrete ideal-realism," the organs of the body penetrating one another owing to the presence of what Hegel calls a " concrete-notion " (*Begriff*), and Driesch an " entelechy," to say nothing of the ideal unity of species. The *churinga* belief, again, is analogous to the philosophical notion of the soul as an individual determination of the world soul, while psychologically the totemic concept finds expression in our Public School and University system, and more particularly in the theological doctrine of a Visible Church wherein the faithful become " partakers of the Divine Nature " through sacramental grace.

The modern philosopher or theologian finds no contradiction in regarding " an entity as both itself and something else," because he considers it in its different aspects—as a material object, and as something that participates in it—just as he understands how a thing may be in several places at the same time by reason of the dynamic multipresence of a superspatial entity in different portions of space. It is only to a very crude type of mind, able to think merely in terms of observation and experiment, that inanimate matter appears incapable of possessing spiritual properties. While this undoubtedly is quite foreign to primitive mentality, it cannot be maintained that it has a monopoly of collective representations. Wherever emotion qualifies our intellectual operations we cease to be strictly logical and critical, and become immersed in the sentiments of our community.

E. O. JAMES.

Two Glastonbury Legends. By J. Armitage Robinson, D.D. Cambridge University Press. 2s. 6d. Pp. 68+x. Plates vii.

Our readers will welcome a summary of the conclusions of so painstaking a scholar in this admirably clear monograph on the legends of King Arthur and St. Joseph of Arimathea.

William of Malmesbury, the earliest authority, who wrote in 1125 when the church of Glastonbury was already of great "Antiquity," is cleared from the charge of being uncritical as regards the Arthurian legend on the ground that passages justly so charged are later additions to his original text. The legend of King Lucius, who, like King Coel of whose legend this is also true, belongs as much to London as to Glastonbury, is apparently rehabilitated. William of Malmesbury believed also in the historicity of King Arthur, of Guinevere, and of Gawain, though it is "practically certain that he never heard the name of Joseph of Arimathea in connection with Glastonbury, nor indeed the name of King Arthur." But it should be made clear that this statement is only justified if we accept all Dr. Robinson's elisions from William of Malmesbury which he considers later additions, and no critical apparatus is given in this booklet to show how they are decided to be such.

Neither is Geoffrey of Monmouth admitted to have knowledge of any such connection. The coming of Joseph of Arimathea is thus said to derive from a thirteenth-century Glastonbury legend. In this earliest form two cruets filled with the blood and sweat of our Lord take the place of the later story of the Holy Grail. The legend of the Holy Thorn is first found in 1502. "Our earliest date for any of [the two legends] is 1191, Yet they claim respectful treatment on very various grounds. He who rejects them as unworthy trivialities, and will have nothing but the unclothed skeleton of historically attested fact, cuts the poetry from life and renders himself incapable of understanding the fulness of his inheritance" (p. 50).

With that quotation from our author himself we will leave this study to the textual critics of the sources upon which it is founded. If the interpolations which Dr. Robinson detects are indeed such, then his conclusions stand. There will doubtless be further discussion upon this, the crucial point.

The illustrations add much to the joy and easy understanding of this book, and call for only two small criticisms.

A more antiquated woodcut than that of Pomparlès (the bridge, Pont Perilous, over the Brue between Glastonbury and Street from which King Arthur is said to have cast his magic sword into the water) has surely scarcely ever been used of recent date in any new book.

The sketch of the cross inserted in the text on p. 11 is from Gibson's 1659 edition of Camden, there copied from the 1607 edition, but this information is not given till p. 59, where "the form of the cross and the arrangement of the letters" are attributed to Camden's imagination, although the cross itself is said to have been in the possession of William Hughes, Chancellor of Wells, as late as 1716.

It is regrettable that the charming colouring of the illustration (Plate III.) of the figure of Joseph of Arimathea in the Langport window will disappear when the jacket is worn out.

Wm. C. Piercy.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER